





UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON LIBRARIES

Estate of Solomon Katz

GREEK STUDIES
IN
ENGLAND

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: BENTLEY HOUSE
NEW YORK, TORONTO, BOMBAY
CALCUTTA, MADRAS: MACMILLAN

All rights reserved

GREEK STUDIES
IN
ENGLAND
1700—1830

BY

M. L. CLARKE

*Formerly Fellow of King's College,
Cambridge*



CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
1945

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

Contents

<i>Chapter I.</i>	Introduction	page 1
II.	Greek in Education. The Schools	10
III.	Greek in Education. The Universities	25
IV.	Greek in Scotland	40
V.	Greek Scholarship, 1700-1780	48
VI.	Porson and his Contemporaries	67
VII.	Greek Scholarship from Porson to 1830	85
VIII.	Greek History	102
IX.	Greek Philosophy	112
X.	Greek Poetry. Homer	123
XI.	Greek Poetry. Drama and Lyric	144
XII.	The Poets and Greece	158
XIII.	Archaeology and Travel in Greece, 1700-1800	175
XIV.	Archaeology and Travel in Greece, 1800-1830	191
XV.	Architecture. The Grecian Revival	207
 <i>Appendix I.</i>	 Nonconformist Education	 221
II.	Greek Accents and the Pronunciation of Greek	224
III.	Elmsley's 'Thefts' from Porson	227
IV.	List of Greek Scholars who flourished between 1700 and 1830	229
V.	List of Translations from Greek Authors pub- lished between 1700 and 1830	235
 <i>Index</i>		 246

The author wishes to thank Professor D. S. Robertson and Mr L. P. Wilkinson for valuable criticisms and suggestions.

The extract quoted on p. 68, n. 1, is reproduced by kind permission of the Library Committee of Edinburgh University.

CHAPTER I

Introduction

'Greek, Sir, is like lace; every man gets as much of it as he can.'

SAMUEL JOHNSON

SIR JOHN SANDYS in his *History of Classical Scholarship* has distinguished four periods of modern scholarship.¹ The first is the age of the humanists, in which the principal aim was the imitation of classical models of style and of life. The second extends roughly from 1530 to the end of the seventeenth century, and is marked by an extensive erudition and an interest in the subject matter rather than the form of the classics. The third period is that which begins with Bentley, whose influence directed scholarship towards criticism, verbal, literary and historical; while the fourth period, according to Sandys, dates from Wolf, at the end of the eighteenth century, and is largely influenced by his ideal of *Altertumswissenschaft*, the systematic study of all aspects of the ancient world. In the first period Italy was the leading nation in the world of learning, in the second France, in the third England and Holland, in the fourth Germany. The dates of the third period, so far as England is concerned, were exactly defined by Housman when he wrote of 'our great age of scholarship' which began in 1691 with Bentley's *Epistola ad Millium* and ended in 1825 with 'the successive strokes of doom which consigned Dobree and Elmsley to the grave and Blomfield to the bishopric of Chester'.² It is roughly this period which will be reviewed in the following pages.

The English scholarship of this great age was characterised by a concentration on Greek, and on Attic Greek in particular, an interest in and feeling for style and idiom and metre and a keen critical sense.

1 Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship*, II, p. 1.

2 Manilius, I, p. xlii. In fact Blomfield was appointed Bishop of Chester in 1824. The same definition had earlier been given by Wilamowitz: 'Die entwicklung der englischen philologie von Bentley's brief an Mill bis zu dem unseligen jahre 1825, wo Peter Dobree in das grab sank, das sich kaum über Peter Elmsley geschlossen hatte...' (*Euripides Herakles* (ed. 1882), I, p. 277). See D. S. Robertson in *Classical Review* (1936), p. 114.

With the coming of the eighteenth century scholarship shed much of the antiquarianism that had encumbered it. Sheer learning was no longer valued for its own sake, and judgment and critical acumen were set above the accumulation of facts. The characteristic activity of the period was the emendation of the texts of the Attic tragedians.

Again, the scholarship of the eighteenth century is distinguished by its concentration on the classics to the exclusion of theology. This is only natural in view of the secular and rationalist character of the age. Religion was no longer the consuming interest that it had been, and there was little temptation to use scholarship in the interests of theological polemics. The religious controversies of the period were philosophical rather than historical, and classical scholars kept out of them. In the seventeenth century many of the scholars were half, or more than half, theologians. Pearson, to use Porson's disrespectful words, 'muddled his head with divinity', and so failed to achieve that eminence as a classic that might have been his if he had lived a century later. Bentley was a professor of Divinity, and sufficiently interested in the subject he professed to devote considerable time to New Testament criticism. But after Bentley there were few classical scholars who showed any interest in theology, doctrinal or critical.

In the seventeenth century not only did theology take up much of the energies of scholars, but classical literature and thought were approached with certain religious preconceptions, being generally regarded as derived in some degree from the literature and thought of the Old Testament. The old belief, going back to the earliest days of Christianity, that whenever there was any resemblance between classical and sacred literature the former had borrowed from the latter, still survived. Zacharias Bogan in his *Homerus Hebraizon* and James Duport in his *Gnomologia Homerica* traced the resemblances between Homer and the Old Testament, and Joshua Barnes could persuade his wife that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were the work of Solomon. In the eighteenth century sacred and profane were kept apart, and little was heard of the Hebraic origin of Greek literature. It was recognised that 'nature and reason' were sufficient explanation for those truths that were expressed in profane literature.¹

In spite of the divorce of classics from theology there was as yet

¹ See Hurd, *Works* (1811), II, p. 141.

no divorce between classical scholarship and the clerical profession. This was mainly due to the fact that the whole educational system was intimately connected with the Anglican church. Yet it was not only in educational circles that scholarship was practised and honoured. It was regarded as a suitable adornment for clergymen outside the ranks of the universities and schools, and a fit and proper ground for promotion to high ecclesiastical dignity.

Though it was generally agreed that scholarship should be rewarded by the prizes of the established church, in practice it did not always follow that the publication of a learned dissertation or a classical edition led to a bishopric or deanery. Warburton once remarked that learning was 'shamefully neglected by our church grandees', having discovered that Jonathan Toup, the Greek scholar, was languishing in the obscurity of a Cornish parsonage.¹ As a result of Warburton's recommendations learning at length received a belated reward when the Bishop of Exeter presented Toup to a vicarage and a prebendal stall. Then there was the case of Dr Vincent. 'The intricacies of the Greek verb', writes Beloe, 'peculiarities relating to the military tactics of the ancients, many arduous and obscure points both in ancient and modern geography, a most powerful and effective vindication of the system of national education, with various other contingent appendages to learning, have been elucidated by his learning and embellished by his taste.'² How then was it that he did not rise to higher rank than the deanery of Westminster? 'The interrogatory', says Beloe, 'is more easily proposed than answered. Perhaps it is true that with all his great attainments and love of literature the Prime Minister of that day was so occupied with political perplexities and difficulties that he considered the pursuits of the Muses as trifling and subordinate, and conferred distinction and reward on those only and their connections and adherents, who were most useful and necessary to him in the prosecution of his views.'

Yet there were certainly a number of cases where preferment was a disinterested tribute to learning. James Hampton was presented by the Lord Chancellor to a wealthy rectory as a result of his translation of Polybius,³ and Lord Spencer offered C. J. Blomfield a living,

1 *Letters from a late Eminent Prelate* (1808), p. 280.

2 *Sexagenarian* (1817), II, p. 93.

3 *D.N.B.* s.v. Hampton.

knowing nothing of him apart from his edition of the *Prometheus Vincetus*.¹ C. J. Fox went out of his way to urge the promotion of an Irish bishop who had published a mediocre edition of Demosthenes. 'As to his not attending to the duty of a diocese where there are no protestants, I do not value that much; while on the other hand I do value very highly his learning and in particular his edition of Demosthenes.'² Dr Stock of Killala, to whom Fox was referring, was distinguished neither as bishop nor as scholar. A few years later, however, there were to be found several men of high repute as scholars occupying more important sees than Killala. At the accession of Queen Victoria there was a wealth of classical talent on the episcopal bench, with Blomfield at London, Monk at Gloucester, Burgess at Salisbury and Maltby at Durham.

If scholarship led to promotion, it was important to make one's scholarship known by early publication. Publishing a classical edition was to the clergyman what bringing an accusation was to a Roman politician, and often it was done at almost as early an age. Potter produced his *Lycophron* at the age of twenty-three and became Archbishop of Canterbury. Burgess edited Burton's *Pentalogia* while still an undergraduate, and became a bishop at the age of forty-seven. Blomfield's first Greek play appeared when he was twenty-four, Monk's when he was twenty-seven; both were later to be found on the episcopal bench. One suspects that some eighteenth-century works of learning were designed mainly to impress a patron. Perhaps Crabbe's curate who added note on note and dreamed what his Euripides would be, had in mind his own promotion as much as that of learning.

The church was not the only profession in which scholars were to be found, nor did learning depend solely on the incentive of ecclesiastical preferment. The association of the medical profession with classical learning is a noteworthy and pleasing feature of eighteenth-century life. The physicians were described by Parr as 'the most learned and the most moral of all the classes of the community'.³ Two of them, Musgrave and King, will be mentioned in

1 Pryme, *Autobiographic Recollections*, p. 87.

2 Letter to Duke of Bedford, 1806. *Memorials and Correspondence of C. J. Fox* (ed. Lord J. Russell), IV, p. 143.

3 Field, *Life of Parr*, I, p. 31.

these pages as editors of Greek plays. Others deserve mention for their interest in or patronage of classical learning. Anthony Askew was a collector of manuscripts and old editions; Richard Mead and Charles Combe were collectors of coins, and the latter edited Horace. William Heberden paid for the publication of Markland's *Supplices*, and Sir George Baker supported the young Porson. William Battie, besides editing Isocrates, founded a scholarship for classics at Cambridge, and to another learned physician Cambridge owes the Browne medals.¹

The origin of this association of medicine with the classics is probably to be found in the Renaissance, when the medical science of the ancients was rediscovered and physicians learnt their lore from the Greeks. An interest in the ancient world survived in the profession even when its textbooks were no longer Hippocrates and Galen. In somewhat the same way the association of Greek scholarship with the clergy may be traced back to the period of the reformers, who appealed to Scripture against tradition and learnt Greek in order to read the Scriptures in the original. The habit of learning Greek survived, and the scholarly technique which had originally been acquired for professional reasons was now applied for purely humanistic purposes. The legal profession, on the other hand, which had never learnt from the Greeks, remained uninterested in the ancient world. Scholarly lawyers were seldom to be met with in the eighteenth century.

Since classical studies were generally the pursuit of those who were well provided for by endowments, ecclesiastical and educational, the scholar's life was not, except in a few cases, one of 'toil, envy, want'. Even apart from the rich endowments which were the envy of hard-working continental professors, and apart from private patronage, the classics were by no means unremunerative. Translation was not the least profitable form of literature. Pope's Homer was a best seller; Elizabeth Carter made £1000 out of her Epictetus,² and Hampton's Polybius brought him in 250 guineas.³ Even editions of

1 Sir William Browne. He directed that his pocket Horace, '*comes viae vitaeque dulcis et utilis*, worn out with and by me', should be buried with him.

2 Collins, *Authorship in the Days of Johnson*, p. 39.

3 Barker, *Literary Anecdotes*, II, p. 182.

the classics were sometimes quite handsomely paid. Musgrave received the sum of £200 for his Euripides. Porson is even said to have been offered £3000 for an edition of Aristophanes, and we know that he received 50 guineas for his collation of a manuscript for the Grenville Homer.¹ The reviewing of works of learning could also be profitable, at any rate in the early nineteenth century, when Blomfield received 20 guineas for his review of Butler's Aeschylus in the *Edinburgh* and no less than 100 guineas for that of Barker's Thesaurus in the *Quarterly*.²

It is clear that there was a widespread interest in the classics among the book-reading and book-buying public. This public included not only members of the learned professions, but also the 'nobility and gentry', to use the phraseology of the day, among whom there was a general respect for learning. In the eighteenth century it became customary for the rich and well born to send their sons to public schools, and since little was taught at those schools but Latin and Greek, it was natural that those who passed through them, unless they were wholly without intellectual interests, should take away with them some knowledge of the languages and some interest in ancient literature. It was an age in which country gentlemen filled the shelves of their libraries with learned editions and dissertations, and a publisher could project a series of editions in forty-one volumes designed 'to render the reading of the Greek historians more convenient for Gentlemen in active life';³ an age in which classical quotations and allusions were exchanged, and in which the House of Commons resounded with Ciceronian and Demosthenic eloquence. Much of the style of its life, and much of its political habits and ways of thought was influenced by the ancient world.

A knowledge of the classics was sometimes to be found in unexpected quarters. Even the most uncultured of country gentlemen might yet be possessed of a tincture of learning. John Mytton, toughest of hunting squires, expelled from Harrow and Westminster, and drunk for twelve years on end, 'always', we are told, 'had a quotation at hand from a Greek or Latin author'.⁴ Nor does one

¹ Simpson, *Proof Reading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, p. 217.

² Blomfield, *Life of C. J. Blomfield*, 1, pp. 13, 27.

³ See p. 46.

⁴ 'Nimrod', *Life of Mytton* (4th ed.), p. 92.

associate the Hanoverian dynasty with learning; yet George IV used to read Homer—with two bishops to help him.¹ Byron, writing to Scott in 1812, describes how he had met the Regent, who ‘spoke alternatively of Homer and yourself, and seemed well acquainted with both’.² He could produce a Homeric quotation suitable to the occasion, as when Dr Davies of Eton, somewhat drunk after dinner, said to him, ‘What do *you* know of Homer? I’d bet you don’t know a line of the *Iliad*.’ The Prince of Wales, as he then was, immediately quoted a line beginning with the word *Οἶνοβαρής*.³

Among the eminent statesmen of the eighteenth century there were several who had genuine scholarly interests and whose learning was more than a mere matter of a few Horatian tags remembered from schooldays. The younger Pitt had read most of the classics with his tutor at Cambridge, though he never acquired the knowledge of prosody and the ability to write Greek and Latin that resulted from a public school education. We are told that he read Lycophron with ease at first sight,⁴ which is no mean achievement, and Lord Grenville said that he was the best Greek scholar he had ever conversed with.⁵ But Pitt’s rival, C. J. Fox, was the scholarly statesman *par excellence*.⁶ He not only read Greek with ease and with lively pleasure, but followed with critical attention the scholarly discussions of his day and could hold his own with any professional scholar on questions of text and interpretation. Largely as a result of his influence Greek became fashionable in the Whig circles in which he moved. He and his friends would read Greek together and discuss in conversation and correspondence the points of interpretation which arose in the course of their reading. In this circle Francis Horner, when he arrived from Scotland, found himself rather out of place. He had acquired little Greek from his Edinburgh education, and was forced to get up the language in order to be on equal terms with the English Whig leaders.⁷

Though there were of course other influences at work, it would

1 Parr’s *Works*, I, p. 322.

2 Letter to Scott, July 6, 1812.

3 Lyte, *History of Eton College* (ed. 1899), p. 361.

4 Stanhope, *Life of Pitt*, I, p. 16.

5 *Quarterly Review*, LVII, p. 489.

6 See M. L. Clarke in *Greece and Rome*, Feb. 1940.

7 Dalzel, *History of the University of Edinburgh*, I, p. 173 n.

be wrong to underestimate that exercised on the public life of the eighteenth century by the ancient world, and by the ideals of freedom and patriotism, honour and magnanimity, inculcated by its literature. Two quotations will serve to illustrate the spirit of the eighteenth-century statesman whose mind was formed by ancient literature. The first is from a letter of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, to his nephew Thomas Pitt, written in 1751. 'I rejoice', he writes, 'to hear that you have begun Homer's *Iliad*; and have made so great a progress in Virgil. I hope you taste and love those authors particularly. You cannot read them too much; they are not only the two greatest poets, but they contain the finest lessons for your age to imbibe: lessons of honour, courage, disinterestedness, love of truth, command of temper, gentleness of behaviour, humanity, and in one word, virtue in its true signification. Go on, my dear nephew, and drink as deep as you can of these divine springs: the pleasure of the draught is equal at least to the prodigious advantages of it to the heart and morals.'¹ The second quotation is from the preface to Robert Wood's *Essay on the Original Genius and Writings of Homer*.² Wood as an Under-Secretary of State called on the Earl of Granville (better known as Lord Carteret) a few days before his death in 1763, with the preliminary articles of the Treaty of Paris. 'I found him so languid, that I proposed postponing my business for another time: but he insisted that I should stay, saying, it could not prolong his life, to neglect his duty; and repeating the following passage, out of Sarpedon's speech, he dwelled with particular emphasis on the third line, which recalled to his mind the distinguishing part he had taken in public affairs.

ὦ πεπτον, εἰ μὲν γὰρ πόλεμον περὶ τόνδε φυγοντες
 Αἰεὶ δὴ μέλλοιμεν ἀγῆρω τ' ἀθανάτω τε
 Ἔσσεσθ', ΟΥΤΕ ΚΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΣ ΕΝΙ ΠΡΩΤΟΙΣΙ ΜΑΧΟΙΜΗΝ,
 ΟΥΤΕ ΚΕ ΣΕ ΣΤΕΛΛΟΙΜΙ ΜΑΧΗΝ ΕΞ ΚΥΔΙΑΝΕΙΡΑΝ·
 Νῦν δ' ἐμπης γὰρ κῆρες ἐφείσταςιν θάνατοιο
 Μυρία, ἅς οὐκ ἔστι φυγεῖν βροτὸν οὐδ' ὑπαλῦσαι,
 ἴομεν.

II. xii, 322.³

¹ *Correspondence of Chatham* (1838), I, p. 62.

² (1775), p. vii.

³ Wood, like some others at that time, dispenses with accents and breathing marks.

His Lordship repeated the last word several times with a calm and determined resignation: and after a serious pause of some minutes, he desired to hear the Treaty read; to which he listened with great attention: and recovered spirits enough to declare the approbation of a dying Statesman (I use his own words) on the most glorious War, and most honourable Peace, this nation ever saw.'

This is the voice of the aristocrat and statesman, whose outlook was coloured by his own traditions and temperament, and who saw in the classics that aspect with which he was most in sympathy. The hellenism of men like Lord Carteret, though genuine, was limited, and was the result of an education whose tendency was to present a simplified picture of the ancient world, from which all that was difficult and alien was excluded. The following pages will illustrate the limitations of the eighteenth-century education and of the picture of ancient Greece that resulted from it. They will, however, also show the attempts that were made to achieve a new and independent approach and to discover those sides of Greek literature and thought to which men had long been blind. At the end of our period there was undoubtedly a fuller and juster knowledge of Greece than at the beginning of the eighteenth century. To this the critical work of scholars, the labours of archaeologists and the insight of men of letters all contributed. The discovery of Greece which had begun at the Renaissance was not indeed completed, for it will continue as long as curiosity lasts and men are still interested in the past, but it was materially advanced.

CHAPTER II

Greek in Education. The Schools

'These schools may assume the merit of teaching all that they pretend to teach, the Latin and Greek languages.'

GIBBON

THE SCHOOL EDUCATION of the eighteenth century was based entirely on the classics. The system had taken shape in the sixteenth century and was not seriously modified until well into the nineteenth. As early as 1600 Greek had become a recognised part of the grammar school curriculum, and it remained the second language, to be learned after Latin.¹ Other languages and other subjects were scarcely taught at all.² The system, which was the result of the humanism of the Renaissance, remained firmly established, unaffected by changes of taste and belief, by scientific discoveries or philosophic theories.

It had its critics, it is true, but they seem to have had little if any influence. Locke, in his *Thoughts on Education*, published in 1693, subjected the established system to some reasoned criticism. Latin he regards as 'absolutely necessary to a gentleman',³ Greek as necessary only to the scholar;⁴ but the existing methods of teaching he considers wasteful and stupid. Like Milton, he is sanguine as to the amount of time required for learning languages; Latin and Greek, he says, 'might be had at a great deal cheaper rate of pains and time, and be learned almost in playing'.⁵ Grammar he regards as unnecessary—Latin should be learnt by talking and reading—and he questions the inevitable association of the birch with the classics. But those who agreed with him could take his advice and employ a private

1 Foster Watson, *The English Grammar Schools to 1660*, p. 493. The statutes of St Paul's school (founded 1510) directed that the High Master should if possible be learned in Greek. Later in the sixteenth century the requirement of Greek becomes frequent in Grammar School statutes.

2 Hebrew, which in the seventeenth century had been taught in some schools, lost ground in the eighteenth. James Bowyer, however (Coleridge's master at Christ's Hospital), sent his pupils to the university 'excellent Latin and Greek scholars, and tolerable Hebraists' (*Biographia Literaria*, ch. i).

3 § 164.

4 § 195.

5 § 147.

tutor instead of sending their sons to school; the schools paid no attention to his criticisms and continued to use the time-honoured methods of the grammar book and the birch.

Even those who preferred a private to a public education would naturally require their sons to be taught the classics, though they might require other subjects which were ignored at schools. Lord Chesterfield¹ was not only a teacher of deportment and worldly wisdom, but also of classical lore. In his earliest letters he assumes that his son will read the ancient poets, and sends him outlines of ancient history and mythology. He regards classical learning as essential—‘a most useful and necessary ornament’.² In particular, he is desirous that his son should learn Greek; ‘there is no credit in knowing Latin for everybody knows it.’³ Chesterfield’s ideal is one who knows his classics without being a pedant, and does not display his learning ostentatiously. ‘If you happen to have an Elzevir classic in your pocket, neither show it nor mention it.’⁴

Locke, while admitting the necessity of Latin for a gentleman and Greek for a scholar, had questioned their value for the boy designed for trade. In his day and throughout the eighteenth century many who had no intention of proceeding to a learned profession attended the grammar school, and there received the only education that was available, which was a classical one. But it was not until the nineteenth century that the demand for a more utilitarian education began to become insistent, and statesmen like Brougham gave expression to the needs of those who intended to be neither scholars nor gentlemen. But even the Benthamites in most cases demanded a ‘modern’ education only for those who were to engage in the ordinary business of life; ‘for the lawyer’, wrote an otherwise enthusiastic utilitarian in 1824, ‘the physician, the divine, the scholar, the senator and the statesman, Latin and Greek are indispensable’.⁵

Before the utilitarian movement the public schools had come in

¹ His son was at Westminster for a short time, but most of his education was from private tutors.

² *Letters of Chesterfield* (ed. Lord Mahon, 1892), I, p. 121.

³ *Ibid.* I, p. 10.

⁴ *Ibid.* I, p. 119.

⁵ *Westminster Review* (Jan. 1824), I, p. 69. On the other hand, the *Edinburgh Review* (Oct. 1809, XV, p. 52) does not recommend the classics for one going into public life.

for a certain amount of criticism from the evangelicals on the score of their religious and moral inadequacies. From the same quarter came attacks on the immorality of the classics. John Bowdler, father of the famous editor of Shakespeare, objected to the classics on the grounds of their obscenity, and recommended expurgation.¹ Defenders of the classical education had their doubts about its moral tendency. Beattie, the Scottish professor and poet, in his *Remarks on the Utility of Classical Learning*, written in 1769, is in favour of expurgation, and would be quite willing to consign Aristophanes to eternal oblivion.² Vicesimus Knox, a typical defender of the existing education, regards Lucian, then much read, as a bad influence, and would substitute for him 'Epictetus and the Table of Cebes and all the *Socraticae Chartae* exhibited by Plato and Xenophon'.³

But generally classical literature was regarded rather as the source of valuable moral lessons. From the classics, it was believed, the boy would imbibe noble and generous sentiments and would learn to seek after virtue and eschew vice. The differences between pagan and Christian ideals were ignored, and it seemed in no way strange that an education officially Christian should go to non-Christian sources for its moral lessons. In the classics, according to Anthony Blackwall, an Anglican schoolmaster, 'the Precepts of a virtuous and happy Life are set off in the Light and Gracefulness of clear and moving Expression; and *Eloquence* is meritoriously employ'd in indicating and adorning *Religion*. This makes deep *Impressions* on the minds of young Gentlemen, and charms them with the love of Goodness so engagingly dress'd and so beautifully commended.'⁴ At the beginning of the nineteenth century H. D. Hill, a Presbyterian professor, writes: 'So amiable are the colours in which virtue is

1 *Remarks on Dr Vincent's Defence* (1802), pp. 14, 31. There is a strong attack on the obscenity of the classics in *Academic Errors, or Recollections of Youth*, by a member of the University of Cambridge, 1817—a not uninteresting story of educational folly and sense.

2 *Essays* (1778), p. 542.

3 Knox, *Liberal Education*, p. 126. Knox's book, of no permanent value, was widely read in his day. The Table of Cebes, at that time attributed to Socrates's disciple, was regarded with great respect for its moral teaching. 'One of the finest remains of antiquity' (Dalzel, *Substance of Lectures*, II, p. 324).

4 *Introduction to the Classics* (1718), p. 70.

painted in their compositions; so captivating are the examples of magnanimity, heroism and generosity, to which they perpetually allude, that he who peruses them must insensibly imbibe somewhat of the exalted spirit which they breathe.'¹

In particular, classical literature was thought of as inspiring manliness, patriotism and a love of liberty. It provided, in Gillies's words, 'precious monuments of that generous magnanimity, which cherishes the seeds of virtue, inspires the love of liberty and animates the fire of patriotism'.² Copleston, the defender of Oxford University, regards a classical education as useful for purposes of war. 'A high sense of honour, a disdain of death in a good cause, a passionate devotion to the welfare of one's country, a love of enterprise, and a love of glory, are among the first sentiments which those studies communicate to the mind. And as their efficacy is undoubted in correcting the narrow habits and prejudices to which the separation of the professions gives birth, so in the rough school of war is it more especially exemplified, in mitigating the tone of that severe instructor, and in softening some of his harshest features.'³

There were some in the eighteenth century, as there are now, who believed that the study of grammar was a valuable training to the mind, and that the habit of accuracy thus acquired would be applied to all branches of life.⁴ Others laid more emphasis on the training in taste provided by the classics,⁵ and their value for the teaching of eloquence and self-expression. In England as in Athens and Rome public speaking was an essential part of public life, and Demosthenes and Cicero were the undisputed models of oratory. There was also the argument advanced by Knox, that as other people have a classical education, it is advisable to have the same, in order not to seem inferior.⁶ Moreover, as Gaisford put it, 'the advantages of a classical

¹ *Essays on... Ancient Greece* (1819), p. v.

² *History of Greece*, I, p. 282.

³ *A Reply to the Calumnies of the Edinburgh Review* (1810), p. 169.

⁴ Beattie, *Essays* (1778), p. 509.

⁵ Knox, *Liberal Education*, p. 184 f. Cf. Chesterfield, *Letters* (ed. Mahon), v, p. 511.

⁶ *Op. cit.* p. 9. Cf. Chesterfield, in a letter to his son: 'Classical Knowledge... is absolutely necessary for everybody, because everybody has agreed to think and to call it so' (*Letters* (ed. Mahon), I, p. 150).

education are twofold—it enables us to look down with contempt on those who have not shared its advantages, and also fits us for places of emolument not only in this world, but in that which is to come'.¹

Of the old-established schools Eton and Westminster stood first in general estimation, and each was known as the home of a classical tradition. Eton was the leading school in numbers and, at any rate in the later eighteenth century, in social importance, and many other schools looked to its education as the model, as they relied on the Eton publishers for school books. Westminster no longer held the pre-eminence which Busby had given it in the seventeenth century. But it was a distinguished classical school, and its close connection with the most powerful colleges in the two universities saved its scholars from the dangers of wasting their talents in obscurity. Westminster produced during the eighteenth century as many as six professors of Greek at Oxford and three at Cambridge; but this remarkable record is a sign not only of Westminster scholarship, but also of the connection with Christ Church and Trinity, and the influence of those two foundations in their respective universities.²

To turn to other schools: St Paul's, the famous humanist foundation; was of small importance in the eighteenth century. Shrewsbury, the great classical school of the nineteenth century, was rescued from a sad state of decay by Butler's arrival in 1798. Charterhouse was praised by Dr Parr at the beginning of the nineteenth century for its 'solid Greek learning';³ at that time Matthew Raine, Porson's friend, was headmaster, and Grote and Thirlwall were among his pupils. Winchester, in spite of the riots which enliven its eighteenth-century history, supplied New College and the Church with some elegant scholars. 'Elegance united with correctness' was, according to Parr, the characteristic of Winchester scholarship.⁴ The classics at Win-

¹ This is the version given by *The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations*. Other versions are current.

² At Oxford the professorship of Greek was a Crown appointment, so that the influence of Christ Church was not exercised directly as was that of Trinity at Cambridge (see p. 29).

³ Field, *Life of Parr*, II, p. 82.

⁴ *Ibid.*

chester seem to have involved a less severe discipline than elsewhere. Joseph Warton (headmaster 1766-93), himself a critic and minor poet, was less of a grammarian and more of a literary man than most headmasters; he attempted to inspire in his pupils a love of literature, and used the classics as a means of teaching taste. In strict scholarship he was not strong, and his pupils noted his habit of slurring over passages in Greek choruses which he did not understand.¹

The curriculum and the methods of teaching at the old-established public schools were not the subject of experiment and innovation; nor was a wide range of knowledge aimed at. Though nothing was studied except the classics, the amount of reading accomplished was limited; the *Iliad*, the *Aeneid* and the *Odes* of Horace—these the schoolmaster went over year by year, and these, if nothing else, the educated man knew, and knew thoroughly. There was much verse making and learning by heart. Little teaching was given on the history and civilisation of the ancient world; such matters were to be learnt out of school from Potter's *Antiquities* and similar books.

Greek was always learnt after Latin, and through the medium of Latin. The Greek grammars in use were in Latin, and the Greek lexica available gave only the Latin equivalents of the words, not the English. Thus it was almost impossible to learn Greek independently of Latin; even John Stuart Mill found himself severely handicapped by the lack of a Greek-English lexicon when his father set him to learn Greek at the age of three, before he knew any Latin. The Greek editions in use in schools were not only furnished with Latin notes, but also with Latin translations.² Towards the end of the century these translations began to be abandoned. 'This mode of teaching Greek without Latin', wrote James, formerly headmaster of Rugby, in 1798, 'is now prevalent in many places.'³ He had some misgivings that without the familiar Latin versions stupid boys might find the learning of Greek too hard for them. Most intelligent teachers, however, welcomed the break with tradition; they recognised that

1 Harford, *Life of Burgess*, p. 5.

2 The Westminster *Choephoroi* and two *Electras*, however (see p. 17, n. 3), has no Latin translation.

3 Butler, *Life of Samuel Butler*, I, p. 30.

the Latin versions did not conduce to a thorough understanding of the Greek.¹

The foundation of Greek learning at Eton and elsewhere was provided by the 'Eton Greek Grammar'. The title, like other things in the eighteenth century, was a matter of prescription. The grammar was originally compiled for use at Westminster by the Elizabethan headmaster William Camden, and was introduced to Eton about 1600.² At Westminster it was supplanted by Busby's grammar about 1647, but it continued to be used at Eton and to be reprinted there, and consequently won its popular name. In 1818, when Carlisle wrote his *Concise Description of the Endowed Grammar Schools*, it was in general use throughout the country, and it was some time before it was finally abandoned.³

Of the Eton Latin and Greek Grammars the *Edinburgh Review* wrote in 1830 that they 'are marked by almost every fault under which such treatises can labour. They contain much that is useless and much that is inaccurate; they exclude much that is highly useful; they are written without a proper arrangement and harmony of parts; the rules are not precise, the examples are ill chosen; and a large part of the Latin and the whole of the Greek Grammar is written in Latin.'⁴ According to the *Review* the Greek Grammar was much worse than the Latin; but at least it had the merit of not being written, as the Latin was, partly in doggerel hexameters. One who to-day glances through the book will notice among other things that it includes poetical and dialect forms with those of Attic prose. The Greek taught was a kind of mixture of dialects and styles. As late as 1842 an Etonian undergraduate at Cambridge remarked that he had been taught Greek at school, but had been left to get his knowledge of Attic Greek out of school.⁵

1 Thomas Orme, schoolmaster at Louth, writing in 1800, describes Latin translations as 'the bane of Grecian literature' (Dalzel, *History of the University of Edinburgh*, I, p. 184). In the early nineteenth century the English 'crib' begins to make an appearance in place of the old Latin version. Some of these literal translations for the use of beginners are included in the list in Appendix V.

2 Foster Watson, *op. cit.* p. 497.

3 In 1818, sixteen schools used the recently published grammar of Valpy.

4 *Edinburgh Review* (Apr. 1830), LI, p. 68.

5 Lyte, *History of Eton College*, p. 392.

At Eton in 1766 the Greek reading consisted of Homer, Lucian, the Greek Testament and the anthology *Poetae Graeci*; in addition to this the last week before summer and winter holidays was set aside for Greek plays, and all the year round the sixth form and the upper part of the fifth had two extra hours per week for the same purpose.¹ The plays read would be the five included in Burton's *Pentalogia* (the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, the *Oedipus Coloneus*, the *Antigone*, the *Phoenissae* and the *Septem*), with the *Clouds* or the *Plutus* of Aristophanes.² At the end of the century there was another selection of five plays in use at schools, known as Pote's *Pentalogia*, from the Eton publisher Pote; these were the *Hippolytus*, the *Medea*, the *Philoctetes*, the *Prometheus*, and the *Plutus*.³ Gilbert Wakefield in 1794 published a new selection of tragedies with notes for the use of schools. The first volume contained the *Hercules Furens*, the *Alcestis* and the *Trachiniae*, the second the *Ion*, the *Philoctetes* and the *Eumenides*. His idea was to introduce unfamiliar plays to school reading, but the selection seems not to have caught on.

The Eton curriculum, which was followed in a number of other schools, thus involved the neglecting of much of ancient literature now considered valuable educationally. There was too a considerable waste of effort.⁴ According to one who was at the school under Keate (headmaster 1809-34), it was possible for a collegier to go through the *Iliad* one and a half times and the *Aeneid* twice during

¹ *Ibid.* ch. XVI.

² A school edition of these two plays was published in 1695, and continued in use for some time. The *Plutus* was published separately at Eton in 1768.

³ The *Hippolytus* and *Medea* (from Musgrave's edition) were published at Eton in 1792. The *Philoctetes* and the *Prometheus* were edited by Morell (Eton, 1777 and 1767). Before the appearance of Burton's *Pentalogia*, Sophocles could be read in Johnson's edition (Eton, 1746); and in 1748 Morell had published the *Hecuba*, *Orestes*, *Phoenissae* and *Alcestis* from King's edition for use at Eton. In 1729 a volume containing the *Choephoroi* and the two *Electras* was published for use at Westminster.

⁴ It looks as if a system originally intended for boys who left school for the university at an early age remained unaltered when, as at the end of the eighteenth century, they usually left at about the same age as they do to-day. One who like Charles Fox left Eton at fifteen would have got almost as much out of the education as a collegier who went on to King's at eighteen or nineteen.

his period at school. At the same time he would read of the *Odyssey* only a few hundred lines from *Poetae Graeci*, 'a very meagre and insufficient anthology'.¹ The prose writers were known from *Scriptores Graeci*, 'a wretched compilation', consisting of 'a lump of Lucian, with a veneer, gradually thickened, of scraps of Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon and Plato'.² These two books were in use at other schools besides Eton, though towards the end of the eighteenth century the selections of the Edinburgh professor Dalzel, *Collectanea Maiora* and *Minora*, began to replace them. *Collectanea Minora* was a selection of elementary pieces; *Collectanea Maiora* contained more advanced extracts. It was in two volumes, one of prose, the other of verse. The latter included two complete plays, the *Oedipus Tyrannus* and the *Medea*, and the two volumes between them would provide almost all that was needed for school reading. No extracts from the *Iliad* were included; no doubt it was assumed that it would maintain its place independently in the school curriculum. Aristophanes was not represented, for a different reason; his comedies, said Dalzel in his Edinburgh lectures, were 'so full of ribaldry and buffoonery', that he could scarcely recommend them.³

In the Eton of Keate, and presumably of his predecessors also, written translations into English were unknown,⁴ though oral construing was, of course, regularly practised. The translation of English into Latin or Greek was equally unknown.⁵ Composition, a word to-day applied to translation into the learned languages, then meant the old humanist art of original composition. The 'theme' (that is to say, a Latin essay) and the composition of original verse, Latin and Greek, were important features of the system. At Eton in 1766 there were three compositions each week for the two highest forms: Latin prose, Latin elegiacs and Latin lyrics, or, in the sixth form, Greek iambics. Eton was famed for its verse compositions; several volumes of them were published under the title *Musae Etonenses*. There was a recognisable Eton style, something rather different from that of the

1 Lyte, *op. cit.* p. 391.

3 *Substance of Lectures*, II, p. 146.

5 At Rugby under James translation from and into Latin was practised (Butler, *op. cit.* I, p. 25).

2 *Ibid.* p. 392.

4 Lyte, *op. cit.* p. 394.

ancients.¹ The Etonian prided himself on his knowledge of prosody; 'Though it sounds impertinent to say so,' wrote Charles Fox, 'I think none but those who have been at Eton have a correct notion of Greek or even Latin metre.'²

Well-endowed schools such as Eton and Winchester had the advantage—or perhaps disadvantage—of an established tradition of scholarship. But in all but a few schools material and intellectual prosperity depended solely on the headmaster. Under a man of learning and ability a school might rise to importance, but since education then depended more on personality and less on externals, the reputation thus acquired might quickly vanish with the departure of the headmaster; the boarders would leave, and there would remain only a few local boys laboriously construing at one end of the school-room while at the other the usher's class wrestled with *Propria quae maribus* and *As in praesenti*.

Men of real learning often accepted headmasterships of provincial grammar schools. Bentley himself was for a short time master of Spalding School. Dawes left Cambridge to become master at Newcastle-on-Tyne. He had himself been at school at Market Bosworth, a school which in the early part of the century enjoyed a reputation under Anthony Blackwall, author of a popular *Introduction to the Classics*. Its reputation did not survive after Blackwall's day. So too Nottingham High School was at one time a seat of classical learning, but by the end of the century its fame had completely departed.³ Taunton Grammar School flourished for a time under James Upton, an editor of classical texts.⁴

Dr Parr, having failed to get the headmastership of Harrow at the age of twenty-four, started a school of his own at Stanmore near-by, taking with him forty pupils from Harrow. The school's early success did not prove lasting, and he left for Colchester Grammar School, and later moved once more to Norwich. Pupils would come with him and leave when he left. Maltby, his favourite pupil at Norwich,

¹ A Salopian at Cambridge in 1815 described it as peculiar (Butler, *op. cit.* 1, p. 108).

² Letter to Lord Holland, Sept. 28, 1800.

³ Carlisle, *Concise Description of the Endowed Grammar Schools*, II, p. 278.

⁴ *D.N.B.* s.v. James Upton.

went on to Winchester when Parr left for the curacy of Hatton. Another successful headmaster was Richard Valpy,¹ author of Greek and Latin grammars, under whom Reading School flourished from 1781 to 1830. Among the pupils attracted from afar by his reputation was Peter Paul Dobree from Guernsey.

Headmasters such as Parr and Valpy, not being slaves of a tradition, might introduce a more varied classical curriculum than that of Eton or Westminster. Parr's pupils at Stanmore had more Greek in proportion to Latin than was usual at that time. Indeed, they had more of it than would nowadays be thought good for them. 'For three or four weeks', we are told, 'before the usual holidays, Dr Parr was accustomed to make the boys of the upper school read the Greek plays for seven or eight hours together; and he sometimes kept them so employed till near eleven o'clock at night.'² Parr was a stern taskmaster, but he was not a mere grammarian, and his pupils recalled with admiration his explanatory comment and literary illustrations. His recitation of parallel passages from English poets was so impressive to that age of sensibility that some of his hearers were moved to tears.³ The Greek historians and philosophers, who were neglected at Eton, were read at Stanmore, and more attention was paid to their matter than to their words. Parr, though in the use of the birch he was a typical eighteenth-century schoolmaster, had discovered what others of the type had not, the intellectual and literary stimulus to be found in the classics.⁴

The most attractive and interesting feature of his teaching at Stanmore is his production of Greek plays.⁵ The *Oedipus Tyrannus*, without the choruses, was acted in 1775 and the *Trachiniae* in 1776.

1 'He is to Dr Parr what Dr Parr is to Dr Johnson—the copy of a copy, the shadow of a shade—very learned, very dictatorial, very knock-me-down; vainer than a peacock, or Dr Parr, or than both of them put together. He is indeed the very abstract of a schoolmaster embodied; you may know his profession a mile off'; M. R. Mitford, Letter to Sir William Elford, August 1818 (*Letters of Miss Mitford*, ed. l'Estrange (1870), II, p. 36).

2 Field, *Life of Parr*, I, p. 74.

3 Parr's *Works*, I, p. 212.

4 In later life, however, we find him advocating a strictly linguistic training: 'Work them day and night with trochees, iambics and anapaests'; 'Make them read Vigerus twice every year for five or six or seven years' (Parr's *Works*, VIII, pp. 482, 483).

5 Field, *op. cit.* I, p. 78.

Garrick provided the costumes and Foote the scenery. The plays were a success; Parr believed in their educational value, and intended to make the production an annual feature. He did not, however, continue these experiments in Colchester or Norwich. Parr's productions at Stanmore are believed to have been the first of their kind in England, though in Ireland a Greek play had been performed by the pupils of Dr Sheridan.¹ The example of Dr Parr was followed by Valpy in the early part of the nineteenth century; some plays of Sophocles and Euripides were performed by his pupils at Reading, 'with the strict costume of ancient Greece'.² This tribute to archaeological correctness makes us conscious that we are in a new century. It is unlikely that the costumes lent to Parr by Garrick were strictly those of ancient Greece.

Not only at Eton or Westminster or under a Parr or a Valpy, but also in many small grammar schools throughout the country, one could acquire a classical education.³ In Westmorland and Cumberland (counties, it must be admitted, unusually well supplied educationally) there were no fewer than twenty-seven schools at which some Greek was taught. In some of these it is hard to believe that many boys got beyond the elements, though at Great Blencow in Cumberland, we are told, 'young men frequently read the higher classics',⁴ and at Heversham in Westmorland the curriculum included Anacreon, Homer, Demosthenes and Sophocles.⁵ At most of the smaller grammar schools it is unlikely that more was attempted in the way of Greek reading than Homer, Xenophon and the Greek Testament. A few were, however, more ambitious. At Dorchester Pindar was read, and also Homer, Sophocles, Euripides, Herodotus and Thucydides.⁶ At Louth there was an impressive variety of Greek reading; the language was begun at the age of eleven, sometimes at nine or ten. Starting with Priest's *Delectus* and Dalzel's *Collectanea*, the boys went on to Xenophon, Homer, the tragedians (particularly

1 Moore, *Life of Sheridan*, I, p. 9.

2 Carlisle, *Concise Description of the Endowed Grammar Schools*, I, p. 38. See also *Letters of Miss Mitford* (ed. l'Estrange), II, p. 40.

3 The facts in this paragraph come from Carlisle's *Concise Description*. The date is 1818. Almost all the grammar schools then in existence dated from earlier than the eighteenth century.

4 Carlisle, *op. cit.* I, p. 170.

5 *Ibid.* II, p. 707.

6 *Ibid.* I, p. 366.

the plays edited by Porson), Demosthenes (in Mounteney's edition), Pindar, Herodotus and Thucydides.¹

But as the eighteenth century drew to a close the demand for a classical education had begun to fall short of the supply. In 1818, at the time of Brougham's commission on educational endowments, a considerable number of the endowed grammar schools were conducted as elementary schools, and the teaching of Latin and Greek, for which their funds were legally intended, had been given up. At Hertford Grammar School, where not so long before Dr Carr, the translator of Lucian,² had been headmaster, none of the boys was engaged on Greek; the parents thought it unnecessary.³ At Newport Grammar School (Essex) Latin and Greek had ceased to be required, and only reading, writing and arithmetic were taught.⁴ A similar situation is reported from Stafford Grammar School where 'not a sixth part of the boys ever wish to learn the classics, being principally destined for commerce and manufacture', and consequently the system of education was 'chiefly directed to English grammar, writing and arithmetic'.⁵ In village and in manufacturing town alike there was little demand for anything more than a utilitarian education.

Of the twenty-seven grammar schools in Westmorland and Cumberland it is unlikely that many survived the nineteenth century as classical schools. In 1864 out of 782 old endowed schools in England and Wales only 209 were full classical schools; 183 taught little or no Greek, and 340 taught neither Greek nor Latin.⁶ But if the old type of grammar school died out, the new public school provided an education still based on the classics; and with the coming of the railways it became easier for those who wished for such an education and could afford it to get it outside their own locality. Classics became more and more closely connected with the public school system.

Any danger there might have been of a drastic educational reform at the beginning of the nineteenth century was averted by the efforts

1 Carlisle, *Concise Description*, I, p. 829.

2 John Carr (1732-1807) translated Lucian in five volumes, 1773-98.

3 Carlisle, *op. cit.* I, p. 548.

4 *Ibid.* I, p. 438.

5 *Ibid.* II, p. 491.

6 *Report of Schools Inquiry Commission*, I, p. 131. The other fifty schools were in abeyance.

of certain schoolmasters, who introduced a greater efficiency and a new life into the old system. The classical education survived, and the criticisms of utilitarians and reformers were confounded by the liberalism and intellectual alertness of headmasters, and by the worldly success which attended *their* pupils. The first of the great nineteenth-century headmasters was Samuel Butler of Shrewsbury. To him Hawtrey of Eton turned for advice; and Longley, on his appointment to Harrow, even attended a lesson at Shrewsbury to see how it should be done. 'The advance of learning among the young', wrote Drury of Harrow to Butler in 1835, 'has decidedly, at all English schools of any note, generally taken its impulse from you, and where it has not, as at Westminster, the decadence has been doleful.'¹

Butler's most important innovation was the examination. He seems to have been the first schoolmaster to test his boys' progress regularly by written papers, and to make the order in form and school depend upon performance in these. Before him such examinations as had taken place had been conducted by governors as part of an inspection of the school, or by university authorities electing scholars to their colleges. The school order was not changed by good or bad performance, but was determined by seniority. Butler instituted half-yearly examinations, and a system of marking for school work; to him we owe the introduction of the competitive system into school education.

As regards the curriculum Butler made no very striking innovations. He paid some attention, however, to ancient history, and he succeeded in persuading his pupils to supplement their class work by reading out of school. Kennedy, when he went to the university, had read by himself all Thucydides, all Sophocles and Aeschylus, much of Aristophanes, Pindar, Herodotus, Demosthenes and Plato, besides Tacitus and Cicero.² Butler had the power of arousing enthusiasm for the classics. 'Dr Butler', wrote one of his pupils, 'certainly did make us believe that Latin and Greek were the one thing worth living for.'³

Verse composition was still practised, and with zeal and efficiency. Shrewsbury in fact took the place of Eton as a school for versifiers,

¹ Butler, *Life of Samuel Butler*, I, Introd. p. 2.

² *Ibid.* I, p. 253.

³ *Ibid.* I, p. 211.

and *Sabrinæ Corolla* is the nineteenth-century counterpart of *Musæ Etonenses*. Prose composition was also practised, and with greater care for classical idiom than had formerly been usual. The eighteenth-century schoolboy had learned to write Latin because Latin had once been the language of Europe and might still be occasionally needed. The Latin he thus acquired was not strictly Ciceronian. It was a language to be used, without any particular elegances and with certain unclassical idioms hallowed by long-established usage. He did not learn to write Greek prose, because he would never need to write in Greek. The nineteenth-century schoolboy was taught to write Latin and Greek prose, although he was unlikely ever to have occasion to use Latin (since even for annotations in classical editions English became permissible in the early nineteenth century), and much less would he ever require classical Greek. This practice was now justified as a mental discipline, and as a training in linguistic sense.

The sixth-form boy in nineteenth-century Shrewsbury was in many ways better taught than his counterpart in eighteenth-century Eton. He was more widely read, he knew more about ancient history, and his compositions were closer to the ancient models. Yet perhaps there was loss as well as gain. Wasteful and inefficient as it may seem to us to-day, the education of the eighteenth century succeeded in making the classics a part of men's lives as they have not been since. In the nineteenth century, whatever the improvements of educational technique and the increased sympathy with and understanding of certain aspects of ancient life, the old humanism departed. The natural unforced familiarity with the classics which the eighteenth-century education had produced, a familiarity similar to that which a man has with the literature of his own country, was lost and is never likely to be recovered.

CHAPTER III

Greek in Education. The Universities

‘In general the richest and best endowed universities have been...the most averse to permit any considerable change in the established plan of education.’

ADAM SMITH

THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM of eighteenth-century England shows a remarkable lack of co-ordination between the official studies of the schools and those of the universities. In the former the curriculum and methods were those of the Renaissance; in the latter they were those of the Middle Ages. In the schools the staple of education was Latin and Greek literature, whereas in the universities it was logic and ethics. The Renaissance methods of the written theme and the composition of verse prevailed in the schools; at Oxford and Cambridge the oral disputation survived. It is true that the humanities, though not required for degrees by the universities, were to some extent encouraged in other ways, but on the whole it was in the public schools and grammar schools of the country that the classics were taught most effectively and studied most thoroughly.

A young man in the eighteenth century who had acquired a knowledge of and interest in ancient literature at school, and who proceeded to the university, might well feel discouraged by the indifference to the classics generally shown there. In neither university was any classical knowledge required for a degree, except a very elementary acquaintance with the peculiar Latin jargon used at the exercises in the schools. At Oxford the exercises for degrees had become purely farcical; and such scholarly activity as there was was concerned with oriental and antiquarian lore rather than with classical literature. At Cambridge mathematics had since the days of Newton won the place of chief importance; they formed the main subject of the exercises in the schools and of the written examination in the Senate House.

Thomas Gray and his friend Richard West both went on to the university from Eton, Gray to Cambridge in 1734 and West to Oxford in 1735. West found himself ‘in a strange country, inhabited

by things that call themselves Doctors and Masters of Arts; a country flowing with syllogisms and ale, where Horace and Virgil are equally unknown'.¹ Gray found Cambridge no less unsympathetic. 'I have endured lectures', he writes, 'daily and hourly since I came last, supported by the hopes of being shortly at full liberty to give myself up to my friends and classical companions, who, poor souls! though I see them fallen into great contempt with most people here, yet I cannot help sticking to them, and out of a spirit of obstinacy (I think) I love them the better for it.'²

Classical learning was not, however, without its rewards at the universities, for private benefaction supplied various prizes and scholarships open to general competition. In 1649 Lord Craven founded two scholarships at either university.³ In 1747 William Battie, M.D., who had himself been Craven Scholar at Cambridge, and was 'sensible of the great benefit he received from the said exhibition', founded a scholarship at his university. Jonathan Davies, Provost of Eton, and, like Battie, a former Craven Scholar, founded a scholarship in 1810, and in 1813 another was created from the surplus of the money subscribed for a statue to William Pitt. Classical scholarship was also encouraged by the Chancellor's Medals, first presented by the Duke of Newcastle in 1751.⁴ Oxford was not so well provided; it had shared in the benefaction of Lord Craven, but had to wait until 1825 for the Ireland and 1834 for the Hertford scholarships.

At Oxford the regulations for election to the Craven had been drawn up by Lord Craven's brother, and were not so well fitted for testing scholarship as those of Cambridge, which had been drawn up by the university. Preference was given to founder's kin, and there seems to have been no formal examination until the nineteenth century.⁵ At Cambridge, on the other hand, there were serious examinations even in the mid-eighteenth century, and the best

1 *Correspondence of Gray* (ed. Toynbee and Whibley), p. 33 (vol. 1).

2 *Ibid.* p. 56.

3 In 1819 the Craven Scholarships were increased in number and value.

4 J. W. Clark, *Endowments of the University of Cambridge*, pp. 283, 294, 300, 307, 370.

5 See *Classical Journal*, xvi, p. 6.

scholars competed for these scholarships and for the Chancellor's Medals.¹

The examinations of those days were rather less formal than they later became, and were in part conducted orally. An account has survived of the examination for the Chancellor's Medals in 1762.² The candidates bring with them Lexicon and Dictionary. 'The Vice Chancellor allots them a Room where they are to be together, and sets them a Part of some Greek author to translate into English, furnishing Copies of the Greek author without Latin, equal in number to the Candidates, if he can get so many. When they have done this he sets them a Part of some English Author to translate into Latin.' On the next day a subject is set for Latin Prose Composition, and for Latin Verse, 'which finishes the written part of the Examination'. After the exercises have been looked over, a day is fixed for examination *viva voce*; the Candidates are on that day called out singly, and usually set to construe some Part of a Greek Prose Author and of a Greek Poet likewise, and also some Part either of a Latin Prose author or Poet or both, and then the Examiners assign the Prizes.'

In 1781, when Porson was Craven Scholar, one of the exercises set was to turn fourteen lines of English verse into Greek iambics.³ When Maltby sat for the Chancellor's Medals in 1792, he was given a number of the *Spectator*, different parts of which were to be turned, at one sitting, into Latin prose, Greek prose, Latin verse and Greek verse. A theme had to be written on the subject *Summum ius summa iniuria*, and a passage of Isocrates was set for translation into English. This was presumably written; for oral construing there was the piece of Simonides of Amorgos beginning ὦ πρὸς τέλος μὲν Ζεὺς ἔχει βαρύκτυπος (this being in *Poetae Graeci* was probably familiar), and extracts from Lysias, Livy and Manilius. 'None of the examiners,' says Maltby, 'except the Vice-Chancellor and the Master of St John's,

1 The election of Jonathan Davies to the Craven may have been due to the recommendation of the Duke of Newcastle, but in general rewards were made on the merits of the candidates (see Winstanley, *Cambridge in the Eighteenth Century*, p. 12).

2 Clark, *op. cit.* p. 371.

3 This he is said to have done in less than an hour with the help only of Morell's Thesaurus; according to another account he had no help at all.

pretended to understand anything at all about any of the examinations, except it was the Master of Christ's College.'¹ The examiners were certain heads of colleges *ex officio*, an arrangement which presupposed a general diffusion of classical learning. The Professor of Greek had no say in the election of Chancellor's Medallists until 1812, though he was one of the examiners for the Craven Scholarships, in company with the other Regius Professors.²

Composition was encouraged at Cambridge by the Members' Prizes, first given in 1752, for Latin essays, and by the Browne Medals, founded by Sir William Browne, who left money in his will (proved 1774) for medals to be given annually for Greek and Latin odes and epigrams.³ At Oxford an annual prize for the composition of Latin verse was first presented by the Earl of Litchfield, Chancellor of the University, in 1769; to this a later chancellor, Lord Grenville, added a prize for Latin prose in 1809. A writer on the history of education has seen in these foundations 'an evidence of a decline in literary arts which had long been practised'.⁴ It is possible that composition in Latin and Greek was becoming more of a self-conscious exercise than it had been, but there is no evidence that it was a dying art that needed encouragement. It long remained a prominent and inevitable element in school education.

Henry VIII had founded professorships of Greek at both universities, but in the eighteenth century the professors ignored the statutory obligation to lecture and often ignored the moral obligation to study Greek. The smallness of the salary (£40, at both universities) and the spirit of the age combined to make the office a sinecure. It was usual to give a single lecture on entering office, but no more.⁵ And since the obligations of the office were so slight, its holders were generally men of no distinction. Lord Chesterfield, in a letter to his

¹ Parr's *Works*, VIII, p. 332.

² Porson as professor seems to have been accustomed to set choruses of tragedy for translation. Blomfield in 1806 was given a chorus of Aeschylus to translate (A. Blomfield, *Memoir of C. J. Blomfield* (1863), I, p. 8) and Kidd, in his *Tracts and Criticisms of Porson* (p. 392), prints a chorus from the *Hercules Furens* as written out by Porson for one of the examinations.

³ Clark, *Endowments of the University of Cambridge*, pp. 96, 373.

⁴ Adamson in *Cambridge History of English Literature*, XIV, p. 385.

⁵ John Randolph's Oxford lectures on Homer (in Latin) were delivered not when he was Professor of Greek but when he was Professor of Poetry.

son, makes a suggestion which, though presumably not serious, gives an indication of the common estimate of the Greek professorships in the mid-century. 'What do you think', he asks his sixteen-year-old son, 'of being Greek professor at one of our Universities? It is a very pretty sinecure, and requires very little knowledge (much less than, I hope, you have already) of that language.'¹

Dr Parr, who undertook to defend the universities against Gibbon and other critics, could say of Cambridge that 'the persons there appointed to professorships have in few instances disgraced them by notorious incapacity or criminal negligence'.² No one, however, could claim that the Greek professors between Barnes and Porson were a distinguished lot. Markland, the most eminent Cambridge scholar between Bentley and Porson, twice refused to stand for the professorship. He was invited by friends to be candidate in 1744 and again in 1750.³ On the first occasion he remarked that 'instead of going an hundred miles to take it, I would go two hundred miles the other way to avoid it'. The reasons for this aversion are not recorded. It may have been due to Markland's retiring nature; but it is also possible that he was uncertain of being elected against the powerful Trinity interest. Three out of seven electors were Trinity men, and the chair usually went to one of that society. 'Unless it could be proved', wrote George Ashby, a friend of Markland, 'that a majority of the electors offered Markland their votes, he can by no means be said to have declined the Greek professorship. He rather declined to offer himself a candidate for it.'⁴

Joshua Barnes, the editor of *Homer and Euripides*, was professor at the beginning of the century; though without taste or judgment, he was undoubtedly a man of learning. The two professors who followed him, Thomas Pilgrim⁵ and Walter Taylor,⁶ are mere names; we hear of the former that he was 'a very ingenious, learned, civil gent',⁷ and of the latter that he was 'a very honest but most reserved

¹ *Letters* (ed. Mahon), I, p. 107.

² Parr's *Works*, II, p. 563.

³ See Winstanley, *Unreformed Cambridge*, p. 361.

⁴ Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, IV, p. 278.

⁵ Professor 1712-26.

⁶ Professor 1726-44. Taylor apparently gave lectures, though perhaps as tutor of Trinity (see Wooll, *Memoirs of Dr Warton*, p. 314). His notes on Theocritus were published in Briggs's *Greek Bucolic Poets* (1821).

⁷ Hearne, *Remarks and Collections* (Oxford Historical Society Publications), VII, p. 261.

and modest man, of a solitary and lonely turn which drove him at last into a habit of private drinking'.¹ William Fraigneau, professor from 1744 to 1750, is equally unknown to fame. His inaugural lecture is recorded in a letter of Gray: 'Mr Fraigneau made an apology for him (Socrates) an hour long in the Schools, and all the World, except Trinity College, brought in Socrates guilty.'² Thomas Francklin, like Fraigneau a product of Westminster and Trinity, was a less obscure figure. He translated Sophocles, Lucian and Phalaris, and was the author of plays and miscellaneous writings. He was known in the literary circles of London, and was a friend of Johnson and Reynolds. But his acceptance of the authenticity of the letters of Phalaris fifty years after Bentley's dissertation gives an indication of the depth of his scholarship. Michael Lort,³ who followed him, was an eminent antiquary rather than a classical scholar; James Lambert,⁴ the next professor, is known to us from Gunning's reminiscences as a man of blameless life, fond of fishing and interested in botany. William Cooke,⁵ successor to Lambert, at least published an edition of Aristotle's *Poetics* and a translation of Gray's *Elegy* into Greek; but his insanity must have detracted from his usefulness as a professor.⁶ Cooke was succeeded by Porson, and with his election in 1792 the professorship emerges from its eighteenth-century obscurity.

At Oxford the Greek professor at the beginning of the century was Humphrey Hody, who, besides his works on biblical criticism, contributed Prolegomena to the Oxford edition of the Chronicle of John Malelas (1691) in which Bentley's *Letter to Mill* appeared as an appendix. Though he had the worst of it in his controversy with Bentley over the spelling of the chronicler's name, he was a sound

¹ Quoted in Winstanley, *Unreformed Cambridge*, p. 120.

² *Correspondence of Gray* (ed. Toynbee and Whibley), p. 225 (vol. 1).

³ Professor 1759-71. 'Well known to the literati of this and other countries as a man of learning and a collector of curious and valuable books. . . though he had written but little himself, he had been of great assistance to some of the most approved writers of his time by his communications, advice, and his correction' (Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, II, p. 598).

⁴ Professor 1771-80.

⁵ Professor 1780-92.

⁶ Bennet writes to Parr in 1787: 'Cooke. . . is really mad, and ought long ago to have been confined' (Parr's *Works*, I, p. 190).

scholar, and his *Prolegomena* is accounted an able and creditable piece of work.¹ When Hody's successor, Thomas Milles, was elected professor in 1705, Hearne wrote in his diary: 'The Court could not have put a greater Affront upon us than pitching upon a Person void of Integrity, Parts and Learning, especially that part of Learning he is to profess, he not understanding the Rudiments of the Greek Tongue.'² This is no doubt exaggerated, for Hearne was not an unprejudiced observer, and had a grudge against Milles, who had at least edited Cyril of Jerusalem, and had begun an edition of Aristophanes.³ Edward Thwaites,⁴ his successor, was one of those Anglo-Saxon scholars who flourished at Oxford in the early part of the century. His edition of Dionysius Periegetes gave him a stronger claim to the chair of Greek than he had to that of Moral Philosophy, which he occupied at the same time. Hearne, however, thought little of his inaugural lecture: 'nothing else but an History of the Greek Tongue in the old beaten road.'⁵ The next two professors, Thomas Terry and John Fanshawe, both products of Westminster and Christ Church, were wholly obscure.⁶ Thomas Shaw,⁷ professor for a short time in the mid-century, was noted as a traveller in Africa and the Mediterranean rather than as a scholar. After him came a succession of Christ Church men, of some note no doubt in their day in the university and church, but not remembered for any contributions to scholarship, Samuel Dickens,⁸ William Sharp⁹ and John Randolph.¹⁰ Of these Randolph was the most successful man; having held as many as four professorships at Oxford he proceeded to occupy three sees in succession. His lectures on Homer, delivered when he was Professor of Poetry, were published nearly a century after delivery, when the demand for them can hardly have been urgent. His tenure

1 Hody appears to have given lectures as professor. His *De Graecis Illustribus, Linguae Graecae, Literarumque Humaniorum Instauratoribus eorumque vitis scriptis et elogüs*, founded on his lectures, was published, some time after his death, in 1742.

2 *Remarks and Collections*, I, p. 326; cf. II, p. 90.

3 *Ibid.* I, p. 13.

4 Professor 1707-11.

5 Hearne, *Remarks and Collections*, II, p. 108.

6 Terry, Professor 1712-35. Fanshawe, Professor 1735-47.

7 Professor 1747-51.

8 Professor 1751-63.

9 Professor 1763-82.

10 Professor 1782-3.

of the Greek chair ended in 1783, and from that date until 1811 the professor was William Jackson. He was somewhat overshadowed by his brother, Cyril, the dean of Christ Church; indeed, he only got the bishopric of Oxford after his brother had refused it. His habits seem to have been similar to those of Walter Taylor at Cambridge; he is described as a 'stupid muzzy man, fond of tipping in solitude'.¹ Jackson was the last of the old line of Greek professors. With his successor Gaisford occupying the chair, and with Elmsley as Professor of Ancient History (from 1823), Oxford classical scholarship was no longer best represented, as it had been in the days of Musgrave, Toup and Tyrwhitt, by those who lived away from the university.

To foreigners or English critics who reproached the universities with their non-lecturing professors it was customary to reply by pointing to the teaching supplied by the college tutors. It is true that the colleges generally required their young men to attend lectures and perform exercises, but the teaching tended to be formal and uninspiring. Johnson felt some affection for William Jorden and Gibbon for Dr Waldegrave, but neither of these tutors gave any intellectual stimulus. The system by which fellowships were allotted to certain schools, counties or dioceses had long outlived its usefulness, and it might often happen that good men missed fellowships. Bentley himself was never fellow of his college.² The schoolmasters were on the whole better scholars and better teachers than the dons, and to one who had been educated under a good classical schoolmaster there was little to be learnt from a tutor who had gained his fellowship through being born in a particular county, and had stayed on at college only because he had failed to get lucrative preferment in the church.

There were of course good scholars among the college tutors, and among these some who took their duties seriously. Markland was for a time tutor of Peterhouse, though the weakness of his lungs made lecturing a painful duty. Burton, the editor of the *Pentalogia* (admittedly not a scholar of great distinction), was tutor of Corpus, Oxford, for a time, where he lectured twice a week on Xenophon

¹ Barker, *Parriana*, I, p. 424.

² St John's. At Trinity, where he afterwards became master, there were no restrictions on fellowships.

or Demosthenes.¹ It must have been difficult for a college tutor to adapt his lectures to the different ages and attainments of his pupils. Generally little attempt was made to provide more than an elementary teaching. At Merton in 1789 John Bartlam, who had undergone the severe discipline of an education under Dr Parr, had to construe 'Tully's Offices' to one tutor and the Greek Testament to the other.² At Christ's, Cambridge, however, at about the same time, J. B. Seale lectured on the metres of the Greek choruses, a subject on which he had published a book, and Gunning, his pupil, who knew nothing of the subject, found the lectures beyond him.³

But perhaps the universities taught best by leaving the undergraduates alone. Johnson had a low opinion of the formal teaching at Pembroke, but he read widely by himself, and his reading included Greek, in particular Homer and Euripides.⁴ And in the same college a few years later we hear of a 'very sober little party, who amused themselves in the evening with reading Greek and drinking water';⁵ the authors they chose were those seldom read at school, such as Theophrastus, Epictetus and Phalaris. At Balliol in 1794 Southey was told by his tutor that he would learn nothing from his lectures and that he had better pursue his own studies; left to himself he used to rise at five in the morning to read Homer.⁶ Henry Fynes Clinton the chronologist, who was at Christ Church when it enjoyed a great reputation under Cyril Jackson, derived more advantage from discussions with friends than from his official teachers.⁷ He believed that 'Greek learning was perhaps at its lowest point of degradation' when he went up to Oxford in 1799.⁸ But he read a good deal on his own, and it is pleasant to find him removing the Latin translations

1 'He heard his pupils construing and by his own observations led them to the study of criticism' (Bentham, *De Vita et Moribus Johannis Burioni*, p. 11).

2 Parr's *Works*, II, p. 274. So Richard Cumberland at Trinity, Cambridge, was neglected by his tutors except for 'a few trifling readings in "Tully's Offices"' (*Memoirs* (1807), I, p. 91). This work was no doubt chosen in order to teach morals, not Latin.

3 Gunning, *Reminiscences of Cambridge*, I, p. 17.

4 Boswell, *Life of Johnson* (ed. Hill), I, p. 70.

5 Richard Graves, *Recollections of William Shenstone*, p. 13.

6 *Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey* (1859), I, p. 215.

7 Clinton, *Literary Remains*, p. 11.

8 *Ibid.* p. 230.

from his Greek books—a symptom of an age that was no longer content to approach Greek through the medium of a third language.¹

The early part of the nineteenth century saw the beginnings of reform in the ancient universities, due no doubt in part to the growing criticism directed against them from without. The immediate result of this criticism was a strengthening of the position of the classics by the establishment of examinations and a more efficient system of teaching. The old general education failed to survive and adapt itself, and we see the beginnings of the modern system by which knowledge is split up into a number of subjects taught and studied independently. The first split was between classics and mathematics. At Oxford a degree examination was established in 1800, and in 1807 the single 'school' became two by the separation of mathematics and physics from *Literae Humaniores*. At Cambridge the classical tripos was founded in 1824 as a counterpart to the original tripos, or Senate House examination, which had in the course of the eighteenth century become more and more mathematical.

At the same time there was an increase in the efficiency of the college teaching. The Reverend James Hurdis, who about 1800 undertook to defend Magdalen against the strictures of Gibbon, was able to point to a regular scheme of college exercises involving a fair amount of classical reading.² In Greek the books read in the course of four years were: Theophrastus, *Characters*; Xenophon, *Anabasis*,³ *Cyropaedia* and *Memorabilia*; the *Iliad*, I–XII; Dionysius Halicarnasseus, *De Structura Verborum*; Sophocles, *Electra*; Demosthenes in Mounteney's selection, and Plato in Forster's. It is not a very inspiring curriculum, and would probably involve some repetition of school work, but at any rate it showed that the college had more appreciation of its duties than in the days of Gibbon.

At Cambridge there was now efficient classical teaching at any rate in the larger colleges, such as Trinity, where Monk was tutor from 1807 to 1823. Annual college examinations were established

1 Clinton, *Literary Remains*, p. 9.

2 Hurdis, *A word or two in Vindication of the University of Oxford and of Magdalen College in particular, from the posthumous aspersions of Mr Gibbon*, pp. 14 f.

3 The *Anabasis*, according to Hogg, Shelley's biographer, was in high repute at Oxford. Hogg perused it 'with unspeakable gratification and endless abiding profit' (*Life of Shelley*, I, p. 188).

at Trinity during the mastership of Postlethwaite (1789-98). In 1822 they were also to be found at St John's and one or two of the smaller colleges.¹ There were, however, still no professorial lectures in classics. Hurd, who makes the most of the few Oxford professors who gave lectures, does not mention the Greek professor among them. At Cambridge Porson had before his appointment intended to give lectures, but, whether from indolence or, as some accounts have it, because of discouragement from the university authorities, he never carried out his intention. Monk, though an effective college lecturer, was silent as professor. The first occupant of the chair to give lectures seems to have been Scholefield, who succeeded Dobree in 1825.²

The foundation of the new classical tripos was heralded by an interchange of pamphlets between two Cambridge men who both advocated such an examination. Samuel Butler, under the pseudonym Eubulus, attacked the prevailing mathematical education with some rather dangerous utilitarian arguments; and Monk, mistaking a friendly reformer for a hostile Edinburgh reviewer, answered him in a postscript to a pamphlet in which he too had advocated reform.³ Butler besides attacking mathematics criticised the narrowness of Cambridge classical scholarship, and suggested that the new examination should include questions on such subjects as history, antiquities, chronology, geography, metre, philological criticism and ancient philosophy. The authorities went some way in this direction by including questions on the subject matter of the pieces set for translation.⁴ One regulation which marked a certain breach with the past was that which ordained that 'no original composition shall be

1 See *A letter to the Bishop of Bristol*, by Philoquantus (Monk).

2 He lectured three times a week in the Lent Term, and only missed four courses in twenty-seven years. 'It would be', said Thompson, 'difficult to imagine lectures more useful to our academical students than Professor Scholefield's' (*Memoir of the Reverend James Scholefield, by his widow*, p. 325).

3 *Thoughts on...Academical Education in the University of Cambridge*, by Eubulus, 1822. *A Letter to...the Bishop of Bristol*, by Philoquantus, 1822. *Letter to Philoquantus*, by Eubulus, 1822.

4 As early as 1811 the examinations for university scholarships had included miscellaneous questions on history and literature (see Monk, *Cambridge Classical Examinations*, 1824). Some early Tripos papers may be found in *Classical Journal*, XXIX, p. 196, XXXIII, p. 182, XXXVII, p. 157.

required'. There was a certain dissatisfaction at Cambridge with the conventional odes and themes that any Eton or Westminster scholar could turn out, and it was felt that the translation of English into Latin or Greek provided a more valuable exercise than the compiling of a cento of phrases from Cicero or Horace into a theme on *Summum Ius Summa Iniuria* or an Ode on the Death of Nelson.¹

While at Cambridge the examination was based on written composition and unseen translation, at Oxford the methods were different. The examination was mainly conducted *viva voce*, and the candidates could choose certain authors (not fewer than three) in which they were to be examined. Moreover, the school was not wholly classical, but included religion, logic, rhetoric and ethics.² At Cambridge also it was not as yet possible to specialise entirely in classics; the new tripos was at first merely a voluntary examination for those who had obtained mathematical honours.

These new examinations, and the increased number of university scholarships, produced a new thoroughness in study, a desire to cover the whole ground, which contrasted with the somewhat dilettante attitude of the easy-going days before examinations. Butler criticised Cambridge for its concentration on the dramatists and neglect of the historians and philosophers, and we find Fynes Clinton lamenting the narrowness of Oxford classical studies; no Stobaeus, he complains, is read, no Athenaeus or Arrian, no Dio Chrysostom, Dio Cassius or Dionysius Halicarnasseus.³ The ordinary classical student did not feel himself obliged to master such authors as these, but he was expected to have a thorough knowledge of the better known writers. In 1804 we find Parr writing to his godson, C. P. Burney, who had just gone up to Cambridge, to advise him on his reading. His mornings are to be invariably given up to Greek. He is to read the dramatists in his first year, in his second Isocrates, Lysias, Isaeus, the twelve speeches of Demosthenes in Allen's edition, and also *De Falsa Legatione* and *De Corona* with Aeschines's speeches on the

1 In the early days of the Tripos Latin was sometimes set for translation into Greek, e.g. in 1824 an epode of Horace and in 1826 an extract from Terence to be put into Greek iambics, and *vice versa*, e.g. in 1824, a chorus of Euripides for Latin lyrics.

2 See Copleston, *A Reply to the Calumnies of the Edinburgh Review* (1810), pp. 138-42.

3 Clinton, *Literary Remains*, p. 229.

same subjects, Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, *Cyropaedia* and *Anabasis*. His third year is to be occupied with Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon's *Hellenica*, Plato (in the editions of Etwall, Forster and Routh) and Aristotle's *Ethics*, *Politics* and *Rhetoric*. In his fourth year he is to go through the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (with Wolf's newly published *Prolegomena*); twice through Pindar, and a second time through the dramatists. He is to occupy his evenings with Dionysius Halicarnasseus, Demetrius, Aristotle's *Poetics*, Theocritus, Hesiod and Potter's *Greek Antiquities*. History is to be read in spare time; one book is to be constantly in his hands, 'Vigerus on Greek idioms, with the notes of Hooegeveen, Zeunius and Hermann'.¹

In the 1820's Samuel Butler writes in the same way though at greater length to an old pupil at Cambridge.² He expects him to cover almost the whole of ancient literature. Of the standard Greek writers the two whom he considers need not be read in full are Plato and Aristotle. He would apparently have all Demosthenes, Isocrates and Lysias read, but of Plato only the *Apology*, the *Crito*, the *Phaedo* and the *Euthyphro*; 'the remainder of this very voluminous but enchanting writer may be deferred and part omitted'. Butler's classical interests were biased towards the historical side rather than the philosophical. Thus we find him recommending Aristophanes as 'indispensable for a knowledge of Attic law terms and domestic habits'.

Butler gives a specimen diary for the studious reading man. Tuesday, to take one example, begins with chapel at 6.0 a.m., and ends with Latin verse from 7.0 to 11.0 p.m. It may be asked whether the shadow of their former headmaster loomed so large over old Salopians as to make them follow his advice and read the classics day and night. There were some with whom this was the case. We hear of one Price who 'reads eighteen hours a day and said before the scholarship was vacant that he would with pleasure give up the health of all his life if he could but get one of these scholarships'.³ Butler's competitive system had bred a new type, the pot hunter.

¹ Parr's *Works*, VII, p. 419.

² Butler, MSS. III, p. 139 f. (B.M. Add. MSS. 34583).

³ Butler, *Life of Samuel Butler*, I, p. 77. C. J. Blomfield as an undergraduate worked sometimes sixteen or eighteen hours a day (*Memoir of C. J. Blomfield* (1863), I, p. 4). Dr Johnson held that a young man should read five hours a day.

After the foundation of the classical tripos the framework of Cambridge teaching long remained unchanged, but new influences made themselves felt. The undergraduate began to come into his own, to develop an intellectual life independent of his official studies, to form clubs and societies and to meet for debate and discussion. Romanticism made fashionable an attitude of revolt against the austerities of academic discipline. The pot-hunting Price was not the only type in the Cambridge of the early nineteenth century. F. D. Maurice in 1834 wrote a novel in which the hero inveighs against the useless studies of Cambridge and against University life in general, which is described as 'the most withering benumbing influence ever exerted over a human spirit'.¹ He was probably referring mainly to mathematics; but classical studies were not exempt from criticism on the grounds of their dry and lifeless character. The classics, however, can liberate the human spirit as well as discipline it, and there were among the younger classical dons of the thirties some who could sympathise with and guide the aspirations of youth.

Prominent among these was Connop Thirlwall. Even as a school-boy he had questioned the value of a classical education, and though he won Craven Scholarship and Chancellor's Medal, his critical mind saw beyond the horizon of academic rewards. He passed from Cambridge to other studies, and when he returned to his university in 1827 he had already translated Schleiermacher and Tieck, and possessed a knowledge of German literature and criticism very rare in English academic circles. He was aware of the growing indifference to ancient literature, and anxious to arrest it. He believed that the fault lay largely in the existing system of education; 'the main cause which has tended to bring ancient philology into disrepute has undoubtedly been that both in our schools and colleges an infinitely minute branch of the subject has been severed from the rest and treated as the whole. The good sense of the age has revolted against this absurdity, but generally without perceiving its real nature or proper correction.'²

Thirlwall attempted to broaden and liberalise Cambridge classical teaching; his aim was to direct his pupils to the matter rather than

¹ *Eustace Conway*, I, p. 75.

² Thirlwall, *Letters, Literary and Theological*, p. 110.

the form of the ancient authors and to turn them from an exclusive preoccupation with textual criticism and composition to a deeper study of ancient history and thought. His Greek history was written after his reforming zeal had lost him his Trinity tutorship; lectures on ancient history were as yet unknown in the universities. He did, however, teach ancient philosophy, which had for so long been neglected. As tutor he expounded Aristotle's *Ethics* and *Politics*, and his thorough and scholarly lectures attracted large audiences.¹ He may indeed be considered as the founder of a new school of Cambridge scholarship. According to J. W. Clark, writing in 1883, 'it may be argued with much probability that the thoroughness and breadth of illustration with which classical subjects are treated by the lecturers in Trinity College is derived from his initiative'.² Among those who sat at his feet was W. H. Thompson, from whom the tradition of the study of ancient philosophy in Cambridge has descended through Jackson and Cornford to our own day.

1 J. W. Clark, *Old Friends at Cambridge*, p. 106.

2 *Ibid.*

CHAPTER IV

Greek in Scotland

'He once spoke to some scholars at the Gray's Inn Coffee House on Bentley's literary character with such warmth of eulogy that a North Briton who was present asked him if Bentley was not a Scotchman. "No," replied Porson, "Bentley was a Greek scholar."' WATSON, *Life of Porson*

GREEK had been taught in Scotland since the early sixteenth century, when Andrew Melville learnt it at Montrose from a Frenchman called Petrus de Marsiliers. Melville himself taught Greek at Glasgow in the 1570's, and it continued to be taught there and at other universities. Yet though Scotland shared in the Revival of Learning, and produced in Buchanan a notable example of humanist scholarship, her educational system developed on different lines from that of England, and in eighteenth-century Scotland classical studies were not pursued with the same zeal and thoroughness as in the southern part of the kingdom. The Scottish universities did not produce scholars of the English type. They produced philosophers, economists, historians and moralists rather than textual critics. Such names as Adam Smith, Robertson, Hume and Dugald Stewart are familiar to everybody, but few would be able to give the name of any eighteenth-century Scottish classical scholar.

What was the reason for the paucity of classical scholarship in Scotland? The *Edinburgh Review*, discussing this question in 1821, suggested that it was due to the lack of a wealthy church establishment, which could endow learning with rectories and prebends and reward it with bishoprics.¹ There is perhaps some substance in this suggestion. Scholarship in England owed a good deal to a leisured clergy. It owed something also to the wealth of its educational endowments. In such endowments Scotland was lacking; she was indeed well supplied with universities, having five to England's two,² but they were not well endowed, and the professors depended on

¹ *Edinburgh Review* (July 1821), xxxv, p. 305.

² King's College and Marischal College, Aberdeen, were separate universities until 1860.

their fees for their livelihood. Sinecure professorships and fellowships do not necessarily promote learning; on the other hand, a professor who spends his whole time in teaching is unlikely to make any important contributions to knowledge.

Furthermore, as regards Greek at any rate, not only were the Scottish professors forced to teach, but they were forced to teach the elements of their subject. There was little or no teaching of Greek in the schools, since it had been expressly forbidden by a decree issued by the Scottish Privy Council in 1672.¹ This was due to a desire to avoid the overlapping of school and university curricula, or perhaps one should rather say a desire to establish a monopoly in favour of the universities, so that there should be no competition which might affect the professors' fees. If boys learnt Greek at schools they might be tempted to omit the subject at the universities. The prohibition does not in fact appear to have been rigidly enforced. During the eighteenth century Greek continued to be taught in some schools,² though not in the university towns, where the university authorities were in a position to enforce their monopoly. Even in Edinburgh, however, a Greek class was started at the High School towards the end of the century; there were protests from the university,³ but these seem to have been unavailing, and in 1814 the Town Council recognised the abandonment of the old monopoly by presenting a gold medal for the best Greek scholar in the High School.⁴ It is clear, however, that there was no encouragement for the schoolmaster to teach Greek if the universities regarded it as their preserve and designed their classes for the beginner.

The eighteenth century saw the development of the professorial system in the Scottish universities, and the emergence of that typical Scottish figure the lecturer. Under the old system the Regents, who corresponded roughly to the tutors of Oxford and Cambridge, retained their pupils throughout their university career, teaching them all the subjects. During the eighteenth century the regenting

1 Kerr, *Scottish Education*, p. 260.

2 Strong, *Secondary Education in Scotland*, p. 156. Alexander Carlyle (Edinburgh University, 1735-43) had learnt Greek pretty well at school and so omitted it at the university (Grant, *Story of the University of Edinburgh*, I, p. 275).

3 Grant, *op. cit.* II, p. 324.

4 Strong, *op. cit.* p. 185.

system gave way to the professorial,¹ in which each subject had its professor and its place in the curriculum. In 1700 a Parliamentary Commission fixed the teacher of Greek to the first class; that is to say, one man was to specialise in teaching Greek, and all first-year students were to attend his class. From this class the student would go on in the following years to mathematics, logic, moral and natural philosophy. The curriculum, however, was not the same in all universities. At St Andrews and King's College, Aberdeen, Latin and Greek were not confined to the first year, but were also included in the classes for senior students, in addition to other subjects. At Edinburgh the first year belonged to the Professor of Humanity, and the second to the Greek professor. In practice, however, the rigid system broke down, at any rate at Edinburgh, in the latter part of the eighteenth century. Few students attended the full course with a view to graduation; most preferred not to graduate, and to attend what lecture courses they chose.

The general effect of the system was to give the classics a comparatively small place in the curriculum; and the development of lecturing and the habit of attending courses according to choice put a premium on such subjects as were suitable for public exposition. The Professor of Rhetoric or Philosophy was likely to be more popular than the Professor of Greek, who was obliged to teach the elements of the language, and confine himself to simple text-books. In the mid-eighteenth century the books read in the Greek class at Edinburgh were the New Testament, Aesop's fables, Lucian's dialogues and the *Iliad*. The professor, Robert Hunter, used, however, to hold another more advanced class, in which his pupils could obtain 'some acquaintance also with the *Odyssey*, with one or two of the Greek tragedians and with some passages of Xenophon or Herodotus'.² His predecessor, Colin Drummond, lectured to the medical class on the ancient medical authorities while a deputy took the Greek class.³ This shows to what an extent the classics, though they might seem to occupy an insignificant place in university studies, still dominated other subjects. As a further illustration of this one

1 Regenting was abolished at Edinburgh in 1708, at Glasgow in 1727, at St Andrews in 1747, at Marischal College in 1753 and at King's College in 1799.

2 Dalzel, *History of the University of Edinburgh*, I, p. 264.

3 Grant, *op. cit.* I, p. 266.

might mention the fact that in the mid-eighteenth century Stevenson, the Edinburgh Professor of Logic, used to make the students who attended his lectures on criticism translate Aristotle's *Poetics* and Longinus.¹

Among the Greek professors of eighteenth-century Scotland a few deserve some mention. Thomas Blackwell² was professor at Marischal College from 1723 to 1757 and principal from 1748. His personal character seems to have been not wholly attractive. His manners, we are told, were 'affected and pedantic, while there was an elaboration and splendour in his talk which disgusted most people'. He was 'an unpopular character, particularly among his brethren, who could not abide what they called his Bentleian arrogance'.³ He was the author of *An Enquiry into the Life and Writings of Homer*, which first appeared in 1735 and enjoyed some success in its day. Of its arguments something will be said in a later chapter; its somewhat peculiar style was apparently the result of an attempt to imitate Shaftesbury. This professor in remote Aberdeen was anxious to avoid any trace of provincialism; 'his ambition was to write like a man of fashion who lived in good company and knew the world'. Hence the 'levity of the style and the awkward mimicry of the ease and familiarity of Shaftesbury', which 'render the work disgusting to a reader of good taste'.⁴

In Glasgow University Greek flourished, at any rate so far as the numbers of the classes went, under Professors Dunlop, Moor and Young, who between them covered more than a century from 1704 to 1820. James Moor, professor from 1745 to 1774, was a man of some scholarship. He was interested in the Greek mathematicians, and projected an edition of Archimedes, which he never completed. He was also compiler of a Greek grammar which was widely used in Scotland, translator of Tyrtæus and of part of Marcus Aurelius,⁵ and author of an essay 'On the end of tragedy according to Aristotle'. With Muirhead, the Humanity professor, he edited the Greek books which his brother-in-law Foulis printed at Glasgow, though these

1 Dalzel, *op. cit.* I, p. 267.

2 1701-57.

3 Ramsay, *Scotland and Scotsmen in the Eighteenth Century*, I, p. 291.

4 The quotations are from Tytler, *Life of Lord Kames* (2nd ed. 1814), I, pp. 230-1.

5 The first two books. The rest was translated by Hutcheson.

were more remarkable for their typography than as contributions to scholarship. When Moor was incapacitated by ill health, his deputy was John Gillies, a product of Glasgow University, who was later to become known for his *History of Greece* and other learned works.

The most distinguished Greek professor at Edinburgh in our period was Andrew Dalzel, who, having bought the professorship from his predecessor (a not uncommon practice at that time) in 1772, held it until his death in 1806. He was a reasonably good scholar and had an attractive personality. His volumes of extracts, *Collectanea Minora* and *Maiora*, gave him a somewhat easily won reputation and brought him into touch with English and continental scholars. He was a zealous teacher, and in a period in which the Scottish capital and its university expanded and flourished he saw to it that Greek played its part in Edinburgh education. 'He identified his happiness with the success of his class and his students and with restoring the study of Greek in Scotland.'¹ He had the satisfaction of lecturing to large audiences; ten years after the beginning of his professorship the numbers of his class had risen to 180.² Whether these youths learned much Greek from their single teacher is doubtful. Dalzel's predecessor, Hunter, had taken pains to have his pupils well grounded; 'his method of teaching', we are told, 'did not differ materially from that of most country schoolmasters.'³ Dalzel chose to be a genuine professor rather than a schoolmaster, ignoring the fact that there was no one else to do the schoolmaster's job. The defects and merits of his teaching emerge clearly in Lord Cockburn's reminiscences: 'At the mere teaching of a language he was ineffective. How is it possible for the elements, including the very letters, of a language to be taught to one hundred boys at once by a single lecturing professor? To the lads who, like me—to whom the very alphabet was new—required positive *teaching*, the class was utterly useless. Nevertheless, though not a good schoolmaster, it is a duty, and delightful, to record Dalzel's value as a general exciter of boys' minds... Mild, affectionate, simple, an absolute enthusiast about learning—particularly classical, and especially Greek... He could never make us actively laborious. But when we sat passive and listened to him, he inspired

¹ Dalzel, *History of the University of Edinburgh*, 1, p. 49.

² *Ibid.* p. 47.

³ *Ibid.* p. 9.

us with a vague but sincere ambition of literature, and with delicious dreams of virtue and poetry. He must have been a hard boy whom those discourses, spoken by Dalzel's low, soft, artless voice, did not melt.¹

Unlike the classical teachers of England, who confined themselves to expounding the ancient texts, Dalzel dealt in literary history and appreciation, and expressly repudiated what he called that 'bastard sort' of scholarship, 'which, confined to philology and verbal criticism, and overlooking all fine taste and all beauty of composition, was wont to be known by conceited talk, and a pedantic air'.² The *Edinburgh Review* indeed criticised him for trespassing on the province of the Professor of Rhetoric.³ His lectures, which were published after his death,⁴ attempt to cover the whole of Greek civilisation and to bring it into relation with the modern world. He gives an outline of Greek history and constitutions, and describes the manners and customs of the Greeks as well as their literature. He adds a chapter on the British constitution after those on Athens and Sparta; and in dealing successively with the various branches of literature has always something to say about their modern exponents. Thus he compares the *Oedipus Tyrannus* with Otway's *Orphan*,⁵ and his lectures on epic finish with an account of Tasso, Camoens, Ariosto, Voltaire and finally Glover's *Leonidas* and Wilkie's *Epigoniad*. He is full of enthusiasm for the Greeks, whom he saw as teachers of taste and morality, the inspirers of much that was fine in modern literature and modern thought. From the Greeks, he told his class, 'you will learn to think and to act as men conscious of the dignity of your nature, and who scorn to be trampled on by tyrants.'⁶

1 Quoted, Dalzel, *op. cit.* I, p. 113.

2 Dalzel, *Substance of Lectures*, I, p. vii.

3 *Edinburgh Review* (July 1821), XXXV, p. 310.

4 *Substance of Lectures on the Ancient Greeks and on the Revival of Greek Learning in Europe* (1821).

5 'Upon the whole, each of the poets is of the first-rate sort, and must be relished so long as there remains any knowledge of the language in which they have written' (*Substance of Lectures*, II, p. 195). This is admittedly not very inspired criticism.

6 Dalzel, *Substance of Lectures*, I, p. 12. Dalzel was evidently a good Whig and thought that the Glorious Revolution was in part the result of a classical education. 'It cannot be doubted that the Grecian spirit which has always prevailed in England, tended greatly to counteract the encroachments of despotic

This chapter would not be complete without some reference to the Greek printing for which Scotland was famous, and in particular to the work of the brothers Robert and Andrew Foulis at Glasgow.¹ Robert Foulis was appointed University Printer in 1743, and in that year appeared his first Greek book, which was also the first to be printed in Glasgow, a Demetrius *De Elocutione*. This was followed by a number of classical editions, in the production of which he had the assistance of the professors of the university. Among these was a Thucydides (1759) and a Herodotus (1761), part of a series in forty-one volumes designed 'to render the reading of the Greek Historians more convenient for Gentlemen in active life'.² The most splendid of his productions was the folio Homer, of which the *Iliad* appeared in 1756 and the *Odyssey* in 1758. It was produced under the supervision of Professors Moor and Muirhead and great pains were taken to render it faultless. These pains were rewarded by general approbation. Gibbon found that the pleasure of reading Homer was increased by the beauty of the Glasgow edition, and Winckelmann had it with him (in spite of its bulk) on his last journey.³ Preparations were made also for a splendid edition of Plato. Foulis spent some time abroad collecting materials; he went to Leyden, where he met Ruhnken and other scholars, and in Paris he obtained collations of manuscripts and notes of scholars.⁴ Collations were also obtained from the Vatican, and some actual manuscripts were acquired. But all these efforts resulted in nothing, and the project was abandoned.

After Robert Foulis's death his son Andrew continued to print the classics, but he lacked his father's ability, and under him the printing house of Foulis declined. The most distinguished production of the younger Foulis was his folio Aeschylus which appeared in

power and to bring about that republican mixture in our constitution which has been the subject of so much admiration' (*op. cit.* I, p. 7). Another Scottish professor who published his lectures was Henry David Hill, D.D., Professor of Greek at St Andrews. His *Essays on the Institutions, Government and Manners of the States of Ancient Greece* (1819) were based on his lectures to his more advanced students. They are of no particular interest.

1 See David Murray, *Robert and Andrew Foulis* (1913).

2 Murray, *op. cit.* p. 28.

3 *Ibid.* p. 26.

4 Murray, *Some Letters of Robert Foulis*, pp. 15 f.

1795; for this he used the Greek type cut for his father's Homer of 1756, and appropriated without permission the text of Porson.¹

During the eighteenth century Glasgow led the way in Greek printing, and Edinburgh had little to show beside Foulis's editions. In the early part of the nineteenth century, however, William Laing, a well-known Edinburgh bookseller, projected a series of editions of the Greek prose authors. He began with Thucydides in six volumes in 1804, and followed this with Herodotus and Xenophon; his intended edition of Plato, like that of Foulis, never appeared. He enlisted the help of well-known scholars to see these editions through the press. Elmsley was responsible for the Thucydides and Porson for the first book of the Herodotus;² Dunbar, Dalzel's successor in the Edinburgh Greek chair, supervised the rest of the Herodotus, and one Adam Dickinson the Xenophon. The function of these scholars seems to have been limited to proof correction, and they did not supply new readings or notes. Laing's editions thus have little scholarly interest, nor are they of any great distinction typographically; they have some importance as evidence of an interest in Greek literature in the Scottish capital which one would like to think was in part stimulated by the enthusiasm of Dalzel.

But in the early nineteenth century Edinburgh was not associated in the English mind with Greek scholarship. When the Englishman thought of Edinburgh he thought of science and political economy, of the *Edinburgh Review* and 'Scotch philosophy', of Mr Brougham and his Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. 'Morals and metaphysics,' says Mr MacQuedy in *Crotchet Castle*, 'politics and political economy, the way to make the most of all the modifications of smoke; steam, gas, and paper currency; you have all these to learn from us.' Such things were highly distasteful to the Dr Folliotts of English parsonages and common rooms; they were content with their esoteric knowledge of the scholiast on Aristophanes and the 'pure antispastic acatalectic tetrameter', matters of which the self-styled modern Athenians were sadly ignorant.

1 See p. 70.

2 Six letters from Porson to Laing, enclosing proof corrections, are in Edinburgh University Library.

CHAPTER V

Greek Scholarship, 1700-1780

'Angleterre, le pays de l'Europe où la littérature Grecque est la plus florissante.

BRUNCK

THE LIFE and works of Richard Bentley¹ have already been adequately treated in the books of Monk and Jebb, and I do not propose to write of him in detail, especially as his life and his scholarly activity fall in part outside the limits I have set myself. But it would be impossible to pass over in silence the first and greatest of the English school of scholarship.

Bentley in later life devoted himself mainly to Latin, but his work in Greek was equally distinguished and perhaps more fruitful. Much of it remained uncompleted; his proposed edition of Homer came to nothing, and his early ambitious projects of editing the Greek lexicographers and 'the fragments of all the Greek poets with emendations and notes as a single great work',² were never fulfilled. But in his *Letter to Mill* and the *Dissertation on Phalaris*, in his work on the fragments of Callimachus and of Menander and Philemon, there was enough to suggest new possibilities in scholarship and to lead others to a deeper and more exact knowledge of Greek language and style and a more critical attitude towards the records of antiquity.

It is indeed for his critical powers that Bentley was distinguished from his predecessors and contemporaries. His learning was great; but what impresses the reader of the *Dissertation on Phalaris* is not the mere learning of the author, but the new uses to which it is put, and the critical treatment of the literary records of the ancient world. So too in dealing with the ancient authors he first revealed the

¹ 1662-1742. Wakefield Grammar School and St John's College, Cambridge. Master of Trinity, 1700-42. Published *Epistola ad Millium*, 1691. Edited fragments of Callimachus in Graevius's edition, 1697. Published *Dissertation on Phalaris*, 1697, 2nd ed. 1699. Edited fragments of Philemon and Menander (Utrecht, 1710; Cambridge, 1713). See Monk, *Life of Richard Bentley* (1830); Jebb, *Bentley* (English Men of Letters), 1882.

² *Epistola ad Millium*. Bentley's *Works* (ed. Dyce), II, p. 267.

possibilities of conjectural emendation. 'Noli librariorum solos venerari', is his message; 'sed per te sapere aude.'¹ He possessed that wide erudition and knowledge of all antiquity which he regarded as the first necessity of a critic, but in him this was subordinated to the task of freeing the texts from corruptions. To this task he brought that 'divinandi quaedam peritia et μαντική' which, as he said in the preface to his Horace, could not be acquired by labour or long life, but was the gift of nature. It is a dangerous gift, and Bentley himself in the consciousness of his powers at times misused it. But the exercising of it was certainly more profitable than following in the usual editorial path and reprinting the traditional texts with the addition of a number of scholia and variant readings collected indiscriminately from whatever manuscripts were at hand. In metrical matters also more was to be gained from an exercise of sagacity and inspiration than from the mere study of Hephaestion and Terentianus Maurus.

It can hardly be said that Bentley founded a school. There is no apostolic succession in English scholarship as there was in Holland from Hemsterhuys through Ruhnken to Wyttenbach. Professors in England did not lecture or have pupils, and the best scholars were often not professors or college tutors but studied for their own amusement while following some profession. There is thus a certain independence about their work, and they do not fall into groups and classes for the convenience of the historian. But though there is no clearly marked school of Bentley, his influence is certainly perceptible, not only in his immediate friends and admirers such as Wasse and Davies, and in his younger contemporaries Markland and Dawes, but also in Toup and in later scholars such as Tyrwhitt and Porson, who knew him only from his writings.

Jefferies considered that the influence of Bentley had flowed in two main streams,² one that of historical and literary criticism, deriving from the *Dissertation on Phalaris*, the other that of verbal criticism, deriving from his work on classical texts. The latter influence has been the one that has affected English scholarship, whereas we long remained scarcely touched by the former, until we felt its effects through later continental scholarship. Though Tyrwhitt in his

¹ Bentley, Horace, Preface.

² Jefferies, *Bentley*, p. 219.

Dissertation on Babrius was following in Bentley's footsteps, and Porson in the *Letters to Travis* showed the influence of what he called 'the immortal dissertation', it is certainly true that it was not the Bentley of the *Dissertation* who pointed the way to subsequent English scholars, but rather the textual critic, the grammarian and the metrician. Unlike Bentley, however, most scholars of the English school confined themselves to Greek; in Greek there was more to be learnt and more to be amended. The English scholars are distinguished chiefly for the work they did in the restoration of the Greek texts, in particular the texts of the Attic dramatists.

Of those who grew up in the Cambridge which Bentley dominated the two most important scholars were Markland and Dawes, the former duly respectful towards Bentley, the latter critical and hostile, though certainly influenced by him.

The long life of Jeremiah Markland extended from 1693 to 1776. He was educated at Christ's Hospital and Peterhouse, and was fellow of his college from 1717 to his death. He resided at Cambridge for some years; at one time he was travelling with a pupil on the continent, and from 1744 to 1752 he lived in Sussex engaged in private tuition. In the latter year he retired, to live the rest of his life lodging with a farmer near Dorking. He lived in seclusion, seeing as little company as possible, a gentle and retiring invalid, reflecting gloomily on the state of the country and the decay of classical learning.

'Probably', he wrote in a copy of his *Supplices*, 'it will be a long time (if ever) before this sort of learning will revive in England.'¹ This was the reason he gave for his unwillingness to publish his work in later years and for his destruction of most of his notes. His edition of the two *Iphigenias* he presented to the learned physician Dr Heberden, who had previously published the *Supplices* at his own expense, giving him permission either to burn it or to publish it after Markland's death. In fact he published it during his lifetime, and Markland himself in a prefatory note recorded the circumstances of publication. This seems to show that he felt a certain pardonable pride in his own indifference to fame.

Markland is the type of the pure-hearted scholar. He was content with the company of his books; he was without ambition and without

¹ Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, IV, p. 288.

vices. He believed that a scholar should be *humanus*. 'What profit is it', he asked, 'if an education in letters instead of making us, as it professes to, gentle, upright, simple, frank, modest and kindly towards all men, renders us fierce, virulent, cunning, arrogant, malignant and implacable towards all who presume to differ from us even in trifles?'¹ He himself was considerate and helpful towards other scholars, and happy to supply them with his annotations.² Of those publications for which he was wholly responsible the earliest were concerned with Latin literature. In Greek his most elaborate work was the edition of the *Supplices*, published in 1763; to this was added a dissertation *De Graecorum quinta declinatione imparisyllaba et inde formata Latinorum tertia*, which had first appeared three years earlier. The edition of the two *Iphigenias*, published in 1771, is slighter than the *Supplices*. The three plays were collected together in 1811 in a handsome Oxford edition, with additional notes from various sources, and containing also a few letters from Markland to the Dutch scholar D'Orville.

Markland was, in Housman's words, 'the only one [of English scholars] except Bentley who has been highly and equally eminent in Greek and Latin'.³ He was not an investigator of manuscripts nor was he interested in archaeology, but as a critic he did work that has won general admiration. Elmsley sums him up thus: 'He was endowed with a respectable portion of judgment and sagacity. He was very laborious, loved retirement, and spent a long life in the study of the Greek and Latin languages. For modesty, candour, literary honesty and courteousness to other scholars, he is justly considered as the model which ought to be proposed for the imitation of every critic. Gifted as he was, we are not aware that he could have applied his faculties to any other object, with more credit to himself and more advantage to others, than to the cultivation of ancient literature. He certainly would not have been eminent as a theologian, a meta-

1 *Supplices*, Dedication.

2 Many editions by contemporaries contain material supplied by him—Taylor's *Lysias* (1739), Davies's *Maximus Tyrius* (2nd ed. 1740), Mangey's *Philo* (1742), Squire's *Plutarch*, *De Iside* (1744), and Musgrave's *Hippolytus* (1756). Musgrave in return supplied Markland with his collations of the Paris MSS.

3 *Classical Review*, XXXIV, p. 111.

physician, a political economist, an historian, a poet, an orator, a writer of farces or a reviewer.'¹

Richard Dawes is one of the characters of eighteenth-century scholarship. He hardly fulfilled Markland's ideal of the scholar, for though there was no doubt about his critical abilities, he was deficient in *humanitas*. He was not modest, polite or amiable.

He was born in 1708, educated at Market Bosworth and Emmanuel, and was fellow of his college from 1731. As a young man, so it is said, he mixed in bad company and was not as orderly and well behaved as he should have been. No details, however, are given of his misbehaviour, except that he used to engage in bell ringing in Great St Mary's, and lowered himself, in the opinion of some, by sharing in the beer supplied to the ringers. He remained in Cambridge until 1738, when he was appointed headmaster of Newcastle-on-Tyne Grammar School, where he produced his famous *Miscellanea Critica*. He was not a successful schoolmaster. He easily gave offence, and was constantly quarrelling with the town authorities. His enmities found expression in an eccentric publication, *Extracts from a MS pamphlet entitled The Tittle Tattle Mongers, No. 1*, which is described as 'a coarse and vulgar diatribe' now 'of excessive rarity'.²

Dawes retired in 1749 with a pension of £80 per annum. Though still fairly young he produced no work of scholarship in his retirement. He went to live in a village on the Tyne called Heworthshore, where he occupied himself with light reading, brewing ale and rowing on the river. He was a strong, tall man, with flowing white hair. His eccentricities of manner caused him to be regarded as insane, and when he died in 1766 it was believed, though falsely, that he had committed suicide.³

Dawes had begun by following in the footsteps of Barnes and composing Greek verse. His hexameters on the death of George I and on the marriage of the Prince of Wales appeared in official publications of the university. In 1734 he issued proposals for pub-

¹ *Quarterly Review*, VII, p. 442.

² *D.N.B.* s.v. Richard Dawes.

³ Kidd's account of Dawes's last years is worth quoting: 'Rude emeritus otio sine dignitate fruebatur vico Anglice dicto *Heworth-shore*; et quod vitae reliquum erat, in lectiunculis atque pulsu remorum flumen finitimum *Tyne* subigendo aegre trahebat' (pref. to Dawes, *Miscellanea Critica*, p. iv).

lishing by subscription a translation into Greek hexameters of the first book of *Paradise Lost*, intending to continue with the rest of the poem. But later he realised how faulty his Greek verse was, and in the preface to his *Miscellanea Critica* he candidly pointed out its faults. As Porson said, 'he quitted what he esteemed so idle and unprofitable a study, and chose rather to read good Greek than to write bad'.¹

While reading Greek he became conscious of his critical abilities. He made plans for publishing editions not only of the Attic poets but also of Homer and Pindar. None of these was completed, and his reputation rests on his one book *Miscellanea Critica*, published in 1745. This work was read and admired by several generations of scholars, English and foreign. There was a new edition, by Burgess, in 1781, which was reprinted at Leipzig in 1800, and further editions by Kidd in 1817 and 1827. It is written in a rough awkward Latin; its contents, as the title implies, are miscellaneous. It is divided into five sections: (i) emendations of Terentianus Maurus, (ii) criticisms of the Oxford editors of Pindar (West and Welsted), (iii) remarks on Greek pronunciation and on Attic syntax and corrections of Callimachus, (iv) notes on the Digamma,² and (v) the most lengthy section, emendations of the Attic dramatists, in particular of Aristophanes.³

The chief importance of the *Miscellanea Critica* lies in the observations on Attic syntax which it contains. Dawes's name came to be associated with a canon which has not been generally accepted, that which lays down that after οὐ μή or ὅπως μή the first aorist subjunctive is not used.⁴ But there were other less questionable laws of

1 Porson, *Tracts and Criticisms* (ed. Kidd), p. 53.

2 Dawes's attempts to depreciate Bentley, who was then dead, suggest that he had while at Cambridge come into contact in some way with him, and still nursed a grudge against him.

3 A number of these emendations were anticipated by Bentley, unknown to Dawes. Bentley's Aristophanic emendations were published by Burges in the *Classical Journal* and by Kidd in his edition of *Miscellanea Critica*.

4 *Miscellanea Critica*, pp. 222, 228. The similarity of the 1st aorist subjunctive and the future indicative made it easy to alter the text to conform with the canon; it also perhaps caused the 2nd aorist subjunctive to be preferred where possible. Elmsley first suggested that where οὐ μή was followed by a future indicative the sentence should be printed as a question. *Quarterly Review*, VII, p. 453.

syntax to which he first called attention. For example, before his time the subjunctive and the optative were regarded as equally admissible in final clauses; Dawes showed that the optative was used only of past time and the subjunctive of present and future.¹ Again, he pointed out the true use of the future optative,² and to him we owe the observation that where a woman speaks of herself in the plural, she uses the masculine gender.³

Dawes was not a man of great learning or wide reading, but he had, in Housman's words, 'a preternatural alertness and insight in the two fields of metre and grammar'.⁴ He perceived those niceties of diction that the carelessness of scribes and the inobservance of editors had obscured, and his work, followed up by scholars such as Porson and Elmsley, revealed to the modern world the 'sincera Attici sermonis gratia'.

John Taylor, known to his generation as 'Demosthenes Taylor', was born in 1704 and died in the same year as Dawes, 1766. He was educated at Shrewsbury and St. John's, and remained at Cambridge for some time as Fellow of his College and as holder of the university appointments of Librarian (1732-4) and Registrary (1734-51). He studied the law, took his doctorate in that faculty, and published some legal works. Late in life, learning that a valuable college living was shortly to be vacant, he took holy orders, and when he died he was a canon of St Paul's.

'He always appeared handsomely', we are told, 'in full dress as a Clergyman, was grand in his looks, yet affable, flowing and polite.'⁵ Dr Johnson found him the most silent man he had ever seen, but in the company of a few friends he was a pleasant companion. One of his friends has left a picture of him that deserves to be recorded: 'If you called on him in college after dinner, you were sure to find him sitting at an old oval walnut table entirely covered with books, in which, as the common expression runs, he seemed to be buried: you began to make apologies for disturbing a person so well employed; but he immediately told you to advance, taking care to disturb as little as you could the books on the floor; and called out

1 *Miscellanea Critica*, p. 82.

2 *Ibid.* p. 103.

3 *Ibid.* p. 317.

4 *Classical Review*, XXXIV, p. 110.

5 Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, IV, p. 510.

"John, John, bring pipe and glasses"; and then fell to procuring a small space for the bottle just to stand on, but which could hardly ever be done without shoving off an equal quantity of the furniture at the other end; and he instantly appeared as cheerful, good humoured and *dégagé*, as if he had not been at all engaged or interrupted.¹

Taylor, like an earlier scholar also of Shrewsbury and St John's, Andrew Downes, devoted himself to the study of the Attic orators.² He published Lysias in 1739, and in 1743 the speech of Demosthenes against Midias and that of Lycurgus against Leocrates. He planned to publish in four volumes the complete works of Demosthenes and Aeschines with the remains of Deinarchus and Demades. Of this work two volumes, the third and the second, appeared, handsomely printed,³ in 1748 and 1757.⁴ The other two were uncompleted at Taylor's death; his notes passed to Anthony Askew, who sent them to Reiske for inclusion in his edition of 1770.

The text and the Latin translation are from the sixteenth-century scholar Hieronymus Wolf; the commentary is mostly Taylor's own work, though he reprints the notes of Wolf and includes a few of Markland. Reiske, the next editor, while praising Taylor's work in general terms, has some severe criticisms to make. He condemns his laziness in reprinting Wolf's text without sufficient revision; his inadequate preface, with little said about manuscripts and earlier editions; his poor Latin and his longwindedness in historical notes. He gives him credit for his knowledge of Attic law, but finds him sadly lacking in critical acuteness.

Among the Oxford scholars of the mid-eighteenth century the most important were Toup, Tyrwhitt and Musgrave. None of these held any official position in the university. Toup was a country clergyman in Cornwall, Tyrwhitt was employed in London, and Musgrave practised as a physician.

1 *Ibid.* iv, p. 509.

2 He also published a work on the Marmor Sandvicense, a Greek inscription from Delos brought to England by Lord Sandwich, 1739.

3 Taylor 'understood perfectly, as a gentleman and a scholar, all that belongs to making a book handsome, as the choice of paper, types and the disposition of text version and notes'. Nichols, *op. cit.* iv, p. 510.

4 The two volumes appeared later, with altered title page, as *Select Orationes of Demosthenes and Aeschines*, vols. I and II.

Jonathan Toup was a west country man, born at St Ives in Cornwall in 1713, educated in his native town and at Exeter College, and rector from 1750 to his death in 1785 of St Martin's by Looe.¹ Living as he did in so remote a part of the country he was known to most only by his books, from which they formed an unfavourable opinion of him. Reiske described him as 'homo truculentus et maledicus',² and it was remarked of him: 'It will appear from his works that he was not wholly untinctured with that self-complacency which is the almost inseparable companion of too much solitude.'³ However, the same writer goes on to speak of his kindness and goodness in private life, and it may be, as has been the case with other scholars, that his bad temper and bad manners were confined to his works of scholarship.

Toup's most substantial work was his *Emendationes in Suidam*, published in three parts in 1760, 1764 and 1766. Further notes on Suidas were published in his *Letter to the Bishop of Gloucester* (the famous Warburton), 1767, and in his *Appendicula Notarum in Suidam*, 1775. Yet more appeared in the posthumous *Emendationes in Suidam*, in four volumes, Oxford, 1790, containing all Toup's work with additional notes by Tyrwhitt and Porson. His notes on Theocritus appeared in Warton's edition of 1770.⁴ One of his annotations was considered blasphemous and obscene by the authorities of the Oxford Press, and was cancelled by them; Toup then issued a small volume of *Curae Posteriores*, or additional notes, in which he attacked the Oxford authorities as 'homunculi eruditione mediocri, ingenio nullo, qui in Hebraicis per omnem fere vitam turpiter volutati in literis elegantioribus plane hospites sunt',⁵ and repeated the substance of his offending note.⁶ In 1778 he published an edition of Longinus,

1 After a stroke in 1780 he was incapable for the rest of his life. In his last years he was in 'a state of almost total idiotism'. Parr's *Works*, I, p. 534.

2 *Poetical Works of Thomas Warton* (ed. Mant, 1802), I, p. xlv.

3 Nichols, *op. cit.*, II, p. 341.

4 There are also notes of his in Sammet's *Epistolae Aeschinis*, 1771, and Shaw's *Apollonius Rhodius*, 2nd ed. 1779.

5 *Curae Posteriores*, Preface, *ad fin.*

6 On account of the frequent quotations from Strato's epigrams in a work dedicated to the Archbishop of Canterbury Toup was attacked in a Greek epigram as having hung up the ensigns of Priapus in the chapel at Lambeth. Nichols, *op. cit.*, II, p. 344.

which included some notes by Ruhnken and a dissertation on Longinus also by Ruhnken, though ascribed to 'Petrus Johannes Schardam'.

Toup's name is almost forgotten to-day, but among his contemporaries he enjoyed a considerable reputation. Ruhnken thought highly of his work, though he criticised his habit of slightly altering a previous scholar's emendation and then claiming the credit for it as his own.¹ Wyttenbach gave his Longinus a long and favourable review in the *Bibliotheca Critica*.² Porson's notes on his Suidas show that he had read and studied that work carefully, and though he has many criticisms to make, he expresses his admiration for the earlier scholar in a prefatory note. Moreover, it is recorded that it was Toup's Longinus, presented to him by the headmaster of Eton, that first aroused his interest in criticism.

In working on the Greek lexicographers Toup was following a line of study suggested by Bentley, who had planned an edition of the Greek lexica and who had sponsored the Cambridge Suidas of 1705. In his familiarity with fragments and scholia, and his careful citations of parallel passages in support of his emendations, he looks forward to Porson. His abrupt, confident manner gives an individuality to his annotations. 'Nihil verius hac emendatione' is a favourite phrase of his.

Thomas Tyrwhitt was born in 1730 and educated at Eton and Queen's College, Oxford. He was fellow of Merton from 1755 to 1762, and during this period resided partly in Oxford and partly in London, where he held the post of deputy secretary at war. In 1762 he was appointed clerk of the House of Commons, but gave up his appointment in 1768, when he retired to devote himself to study until his death at the age of fifty-six. He was happy in the study of literature ancient and modern, generous to scholars in need,³ a man of pleasant manners and no vices.

1 Wyttenbach, *Vita Ruhnkenii*, p. 168. Another of Toup's habits was to announce an emendation as his own and then add that he has later discovered it anticipated elsewhere.

2 Vol. I, no. III, p. 32.

3 He helped Musgrave (see below) and Burgess (Nichols, *op. cit.* IX, p. 756). It was believed that he was prevented by his sudden death from making provision for Porson (Watson, *Life of Porson*, p. 101).

His literary works were varied and all of high quality. He is remembered for his scholarly studies in early English literature. Of his edition of Chaucer W. P. Ker said that there were few things more notable in English philology; and in the controversy over the Rowley poems his then unique knowledge of the language of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries enabled him to make an authoritative exposure of Chatterton's forgeries. In Greek his first work of scholarship was the emendations of Euripides added as an Appendix to Musgrave's *Exercitationes in Euripiden* (1762). In 1773 he published two fragments of Plutarch from a Harleian manuscript. He followed this with a dissertation on Babrius (1776), in which he included some previously unknown fables from a Bodleian manuscript; on the literary history of the fables his conclusion was that there had originally been a prose collection by Aesop, which had been added to and eventually turned into verse by Babrius; the original collection of Aesop had disappeared, and later prose versions were concocted from Babrius. In 1781 Tyrwhitt edited the poem *De Lapidibus* ascribed to Orpheus; he saw the absurdity of this ascription, and assigned the poem to the time of Constantius, or shortly afterwards. His conjectures on Strabo appeared first in 1783,¹ and in 1785 he published without notes the previously unpublished speech of Isaeus against Menecles. These were all works of small compass, such as might to-day be published in periodicals; more substantial was the work for which he is best known, the edition of Aristotle's *Poetics*. He had begun on this in early life and left it almost complete at his death, though for some reason it was not published until 1794. Another posthumous work was his *Conjectures on Aeschylus, Euripides and Aristophanes*, first published by Burgess in 1798 and later reissued at Oxford in 1822.

Tyrwhitt possessed great linguistic knowledge and critical ability, and his modesty and economy in annotation were additional virtues. His work was well known and admired on the continent. Ruhnken, who rarely reviewed new books,² praised his *De Lapidibus* in the *Bibliotheca Critica*.³ Brunck, Schweighäuser and Villoison were

1 Only a few copies were printed, but it was published in 1788 at Erlangen.

2 *Epistolae Ruhnkenii*, ed. Kraft (1834), p. 166.

3 Reprinted in *Opuscula Ruhnkenii*, ed. Kidd.

among the scholars who corresponded with him.¹ If he had been more of a specialist he could probably have won an even greater name in classical scholarship;² as it was he shared in the growing interest of his day in the earlier English literature, and applied to it the strict methods of scholarship that had hitherto been almost confined to the ancient literatures.

Before we proceed to Tyrwhitt's friend Musgrave, the third of the leading Oxford scholars of the mid-eighteenth century, it would be as well to say something of those who preceded him in the study of the Attic tragedians. In this field the founder of the English school was not Bentley, but an earlier scholar, Thomas Stanley,³ who undertook the formidable task of producing an edition of the whole of Aeschylus at a time when few scholars concerned themselves with the Greek poets. His Aeschylus appeared in 1663 and long remained the standard edition. The standard edition of Sophocles for eighteenth-century England, and indeed outside England until Brunck's edition, was provided by Thomas Johnson.⁴ Johnson's life was neither happy nor successful. 'He is married', writes Hearne in 1707, 'to a woman of a very indifferent character whom he has lately divorc'd, and has had the Misfortune to have his Goods seized. He was put in Goal (*sic*), but is at last got out, and now absconds in Eton College.'⁵ Later he is described by the same writer as 'schoolmaster of Brentford, the same Drunken Johnson I mean who put out two Volumes of Sophocles, and was lately one of the Ushers of Eton'.⁶ For a time he was headmaster of a grammar school at Chigwell, but he was evidently not successful, for the governors eventually purchased his resignation with a sum of money given by the Bishop of London specially for the purpose. He wrote a number of school books, including a selection of Greek epigrams that was still in use at Eton in 1892.⁷ His Sophocles appeared by stages, the *Ajax* and *Electra*

1 There are some letters in Tyrwhitt's *Conjecturae in Aeschylum*, etc.

2 See Wolf, *Literarische Analekten*, IV, p. 550.

3 1625-78. He wrote a lengthy history of ancient philosophy which was more than once reprinted in the eighteenth century. He was also one of the earliest and not the worst of the many English translators of Anacreon.

4 His dates appear not to be known, but he took his degree at King's, Cambridge, in 1688.

5 Hearne, *Remarks and Collections*, II, p. 67.

6 *Ibid.* III, p. 233.

7 See *D.N.B.* s.v. Thomas Johnson.

in 1705, the *Antigone* and *Trachiniae* in 1708, and the other three plays in 1746. At the same time the earlier volumes were reissued, to form a complete Sophocles. The edition contained some new readings and scholia from manuscripts in the Bodleian, but was not of any great note. Johnson was not, however, a mere hack, and Jebb described him as 'a capable scholar, diligent and careful'.¹

Euripides was the dramatist most read in the eighteenth century, and more work was done on him by the scholars than on Aeschylus or Sophocles. His complete works were edited by Joshua Barnes in 1694 in one ponderous folio volume, including the epistles, which Barnes, against Bentley's expressed opinion, accepted as genuine, and two dissertations, on the life of Euripides and on Greek tragedy. Barnes was a somewhat ridiculous figure, vain and touchy, learned but lacking in judgment; but his Euripides contained more original work than most editions of the period.

The next Englishman to edit Euripides was John King,² who published the *Hecuba*, *Orestes* and *Phoenissae* in 1726,³ and died two years later at the age of thirty-two. He was a physician by profession, and regarded classical study as a recreation from his medical work. He did not, however, shirk the labour of studying manuscripts, and his edition is founded on the collation of as many as he could find in England, ten in all. Unfortunately his judgment and editorial capabilities were slight.⁴ The manuscript which he considered the best and chiefly followed was of the late fifteenth century and of small value. He often changed the text from his manuscripts and sometimes from conjecture, and seldom informed the reader that he was doing so. His changes were almost all on metrical grounds, and his notes deal chiefly with questions of metre. On this subject he showed no great insight, though Valckenaer described him as 'metricarum rationum longe quam Graece peritior'.⁵

King's three plays were reissued in 1748, with the addition of the *Alcestis*, by Thomas Morell,⁶ who, like King, was an Etonian, and

¹ Jebb, *Sophocles* (text), p. xxxviii, n. 4.

² 1696-1728. Eton and King's College, Cambridge.

³ As these were the first three plays in the traditional order it is probable that King intended to edit all Euripides.

⁴ See Porson, *Hecuba*, Preface.

⁵ *Phoenissae*, p. 25.

⁶ 1703-84, Eton and King's College, Cambridge.

designed his edition for the use of his old school. Morell is now remembered if at all as Handel's librettist, the author of 'See the Conquering Hero Comes'. In his own day he was probably better known as the author of Morell's *Thesaurus* and of school editions of Greek plays. 'He devoted a long life', we are told, 'to classical learning; and though his attainments or his keenness were not equal to those of a Porson, he rendered many services to classical readers.'¹ The most substantial of his services was to composers of Greek verse. His *Thesaurus Graecae Poesews sive Lexicon Graeco-Prosodiacum* appeared in 1762, in two bulky volumes. It was the Greek counterpart of the *Gradus ad Parnassum*, and provided a poetical vocabulary, complete with examples, synonyms and suitable epithets, derived, in the manner of the day, from Greek poetry of diverse style and period. It was the first work of its kind to be compiled, and Maltby, who reissued it with improvements in 1815, acknowledged the remarkable industry and learning of his predecessor.

Morell produced other books for school use, in which there was little original work, including editions of the *Philoctetes* (1757) and the *Prometheus* (1767) and the four plays of Euripides already mentioned. He was solely responsible for the *Alcestis*; in the other plays he was nominally reprinting King's edition, but he made several alterations without informing the reader. He also published blank verse translations of the *Hecuba* (1749) and the *Prometheus* (1773). The first is said to be a very feeble rendering; of the latter a reviewer remarked that it was not 'impregnated with the fire of Aeschylus',² which was perhaps hardly to be expected from the poet of *Judas Maccabaeus*.

More important work on the Greek tragedians was done by the Devonian scholars, Heath and Musgrave. Benjamin Heath (1704-66) was town clerk of Exeter, a wealthy man, who collected books and studied Greek for his own amusement. It is doubtful whether he went to the university, though he was given an honorary degree of Oxford on the publication of his *Notes on the Greek Tragedians* in 1762. He seems to have worked independently, and we do not know much about him. He collated no manuscripts, published no *scholia inedita*, but he applied his intelligence to questions of textual criticism.

1 Nichols, *op. cit.* 1, p. 655.

2 *Monthly Review*, Apr. 1774, p. 326.

He observed that editors of Sophocles since Turnebus had followed Triclinius's text and regarded his emendations as having ancient authority; what was wanted, according to Heath, was a return to the Aldine text, which should be emended from the collation of older codices.¹ This principle was adopted by Brunck and by subsequent editors.

In Aeschylus Heath was much concerned to confute Pauw, who had unsuccessfully attempted to improve on Stanley. Pauw was, in Porson's words, 'a miserable critic, in whom singular ignorance and as singular arrogance were combined', and Heath's task was not difficult. Nor could he resist repaying Pauw in his own coin; he excuses himself, as Porson later did when attacking Travis, by claiming that his style has been affected by that of his victim. Heath's work on Aeschylus, as on the other tragedians, has, however, a permanent value. Jebb considered him a critic of fine insight and delicate taste, all of whose work was of high quality.² He had of course his weaknesses; in knowledge of Greek idiom he was not in advance of his age, and in emending *metri gratia* he was, as Porson pointed out, excessively fond of inserting the particle γάρ.³

Samuel Musgrave (1732-80) was a younger contemporary of Heath. He was educated at Barnstaple and Corpus, Oxford, where he took his degree in 1754. He spent some years in France and Holland as Radcliffe travelling fellow of University College; in Paris he collated manuscripts of Euripides and made the acquaintance of Ruhnken.⁴ He took a doctorate of medicine at Leyden, and afterwards at Oxford, and practised as a physician first at Exeter, then at Plymouth. Persuaded, it is said, by the mistaken zeal of his friends, he moved from the west to London, where he was not successful. He was harassed by pecuniary difficulties, and died insolvent at an early age. Tyrwhitt remained a good friend to him throughout his misfortunes, and after his death undertook the publication by subscription of two dissertations by Musgrave, for the benefit of his widow and children.⁵

1 Heath, *Notes*, etc. Preface.

2 Sophocles (text), p. xli.

3 'Particulam istam γάρ adeo deperibat ut semper sibi adstantem haberet ad rimam, si quando versus hiaret, explendam' (Toup, *Emendationes in Suidam*, (1790), IV, p. 465.

4 Wyttenbach, *Vita Ruhnkenii*, p. 71.

5 *On the Grecian Mythology and An Examination of Sir Isaac Newton's Objections to the Chronology of the Olympiad*, 1782.

During his lifetime Musgrave devoted himself to Euripides.¹ He edited the *Hippolytus* in 1756, with Markland's notes,² and in 1762 he published at Leyden *Exercitationum in Euripiden libri duo*. In 1778 appeared his complete edition of Euripides, in four handsome volumes, published by the Oxford University Press.³ Musgrave had some valuable new manuscript evidence to produce. He had not, like most English scholars, contented himself with looking at one or two manuscripts that happened to be near at hand; when in Paris he had investigated the collection in the Royal Library and studied the important early manuscripts of Euripides preserved there. He also had many emendations of his own to offer, and, though he suffered from lack of leisure and of books, and his work is uneven, his claim to have advanced the study of his author is generally admitted.

Toup, Tyrwhitt and Musgrave, though their editions were published by the Oxford Press, were not closely associated with their university. Official Oxford in the middle of the century was best represented by Thomas Warton, fellow of Trinity College, and Professor first of Poetry, later of History. His personality belongs rather to the history of English literature than to that of scholarship, but his edition of Theocritus, published in 1770, gives him a claim to a place in this chapter.

The edition was a result of the energy of Blackstone, author of the *Commentaries*, who was appointed a delegate of the Press in 1755 and resolved to restore it from the decay into which it had fallen. As Professor of Poetry, Warton lectured on the Greek poets, and Blackstone suggested to him that he should publish an edition of one of the poets he had lectured on. He chose Theocritus, partly because of his liking for him, partly because James St Amand, who had

1 His notes on Sophocles were bought by the Oxford Press after his death and incorporated in the edition of 1800.

2 In August 1755 Markland writes to a friend of 'one Mr Musgrave', whose *Hippolytus* is shortly to appear (Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, IV, p. 285). This perhaps gives some support to the story that Musgrave got hold of Markland's notes through a friend and published them without permission (*ibid.* note). But Musgrave in turn supplied Markland with collations for his editions, so it seems that the two were on good terms.

3 He had arranged for the edition as early as 1771 (Wooll, *Memoirs of Dr Warton*, p. 387).

collected much material concerning Theocritus from manuscripts in Italy, had left his notes to the Bodleian on his death in 1754. These collations Warton used, and himself inspected some manuscripts in England; he included his own lecture on Bucolic poetry (amplified), Barnes's *Life of Theocritus*, Toup's notes and other miscellaneous items, in addition to the text and his own lengthy notes. Toup, who contributed to it, called Warton's *Theocritus* 'the best publication that ever came from the Clarendon Press'.¹ It might, however, be criticised on account of the excessive amount of material included in the two volumes and the inconvenient arrangement. As a work of pure scholarship it is of small note; Warton was happier in pointing to poetical beauties than in purifying or explaining a text.

Homeric criticism did not flourish in eighteenth-century England; men were content to read Homer without worrying much about the text and its history. Two editions were published in the first half of the century, those of Barnes and Clarke. Joshua Barnes edited the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in 1711. 'I have but dipped yet into his notes', wrote Bentley on its publication, 'and yet I find everywhere just occasion of censure.'² Elmsley, however, considered that Barnes, injudicious though he might be, had deserved more of Homer than any editor except Heyne.³ His many rash conjectures were removed by Clarke, whose *Iliad* appeared in 1729 and whose *Odyssey* was completed after his death by his son in 1740. Samuel Clarke⁴ was well known in his day as a philosophic theologian, but his posthumous fame as an editor was possibly greater, for everyone who knew Greek read Homer and read him in Clarke's edition.⁵ The ordinary reader found here the help he needed in the Latin translation and the brief explanatory notes. Clarke was a competent scholar, with a good

1 *Poetical Works of Thomas Warton*, I, p. xliii.

2 Letter to Davies (Jebb, *Bentley*, p. 146).

3 *Edinburgh Review* (July 1803), II, p. 312.

4 1675-1729, of Gonville and Caius College.

5 'This has long been the most popular edition of Homer, and will always be admired by the critic and student. It had formerly a very extensive sale abroad; and such was its authority, that no edition of Homer, whether on the continent or in England, was published, without being formed on the basis of Dr Samuel Clarke's' (Dibdin, *Introduction to the Greek and Latin Classics* (1808), I, p. 381).

grammatical sense, though, as Wolf said, without any gifts for the more laborious side of criticism.¹

The second volume of Clarke's *Iliad* contained a reference to Bentley's theories about the digamma.² Bentley was at this time at work on an edition of Homer. This he never completed, and his notes remained in manuscript. The most important feature of his Homeric work was his discovery of the significance of the digamma. This obsolete letter, mentioned by the ancient grammarians, was, in Bentley's view, in regular use when Homer wrote, and should be restored to all those words in the Homeric text in which it had originally occurred. The fact that the letter subsequently dropped out provided in many cases an explanation of the hiatus that is so often found in the text as we have it. For a long time the importance of this discovery was not recognised; most people knew of the digamma only from Pope's derisive lines in the *Dunciad*, and scarcely took it seriously.

Oxford supplied the only eighteenth-century English edition of Hesiod, that of Thomas Robinson,³ 1737. Robinson had collated such manuscripts as he could find, and further collations were sent by Montfaucon, the learned Benedictine. Most of the notes are from earlier commentators. There is a dissertation of some length, by Robinson himself, on the life and works of Hesiod, including the question of the author's date. He applied to a friend, Joseph Atwell, for a discussion of the astronomical evidence. This in Atwell's opinion pointed to the date 942 B.C. Other scholars since then have similarly applied to astronomical friends on this question and have obtained different answers.

1 *Prolegomena*, p. x.

2 'Observavit vir summae eruditionis, *Richardus Bentleius*, vocabula ἄνωξ et ἄνώσσειν, quamquam *frequentius* apud *Homerum* occurrunt, tamen *haud fere ullis* in locis ita posita reperiri quin antecedit aut vocalis, aut istud ν paragogicum in Nominum Verborumque fine supervacaneum quod ubique sine dispendio dempseris. Unde merito colligit vocabula ista in sermone Aeolico praefixo *Digamma* pronuntiata fuisse ῥᾶνωξ et ῥᾶνώσσειν. Quod si verum est, consequens erit ut vox ἥῥᾶσσε pronuntiata fuerit ἑῥᾶνώσσε, ideoque (quod notatu dignissimum est) versiculum a voce ἥῥᾶσσε vel ἥῥᾶσσειν inchoatum apud *Homerum* nusquam reperias' (Clarke on *Iliad*, xvi, 172).

3 1701-61, of Oriel, Lincoln and Merton.

Robinson's friend, Thomas Hutchinson,¹ was known for his editions of the *Cyropaedia* (1727) and the *Anabasis* (1735), both of which were reprinted frequently throughout the century. In both volumes he provided a few new readings, a revised Latin translation, some notes and prefatory dissertations. He was expected to proceed to the editing of the rest of Xenophon, and, according to Robinson, had, by his successful beginning, frightened off all rival editors.² Subsequent scholars, it is true, showed no inclination to complete his work, though one Bolton Simpson published a reprint of Ernesti's *Memorabilia* in 1741 and followed it with an *Agesilaus* in 1754, and Edward Edwards, Dr Johnson's 'convivial friend', who entertained him at Oxford in 1782,³ edited the *Memorabilia* with some emendations which Johnson considered 'irrefragably certain'.⁴

The Greek historians and philosophers were, however, in comparison with the poets, sadly neglected by the scholars of the eighteenth century. Scarcely any work was done on Herodotus or Thucydides during this period, and Plato was no less neglected. 'You must remember', said Dr Folliott in *Crotchet Castle*, 'that, in our Universities, Plato is held to be little better than a misleader of youth, and they have shown their contempt for him, not only by never reading him (a mode of contempt in which they deal very largely), but even by never providing a complete edition of him.' The first complete Plato published in England was the *Variorum* edition published at London in 1826. From the universities came only single dialogues and selections. Of these the only one worth mentioning, though it is of slight value as a work of scholarship, is the selection of Nathaniel Forster, published in 1745, which included the *Erastae*, the *Euthyphro*, the *Apology*, the *Crito* and the *Phaedo*. It was from this selection that young men at the universities acquired what knowledge they had of Plato.

1 1698-1769, of Lincoln and Hart Hall. 'A most horrid, conceited, proud, ill-natur'd Fellow, cock-brain'd, and a much worse scholar than he takes himself to be' (Hearne, *Remarks and Collections*, VIII, p. 413). 2 Hesiod, Preface.

3 Johnson, *Letters* (ed. Hill), II, p. 398. Edwards's *Memorabilia* was published posthumously in 1785 by Henry Owen, who was, like Edwards, of Jesus College, Oxford. Edwards published in 1773 a work entitled *The Socratic System of Morals as delivered in Xenophon's Memorabilia*, and in his edition he attempted to show that Xenophon's work was an exposition of a philosophic system.

4 Johnson, *Letters* (ed. Hill), II, p. 410.

CHAPTER VI

Porson and his Contemporaries

'There are three great Grecians in England. Porson is the first, Burney is the third; and who is the second I need not tell.'

DR PARR

PORSON has long been by general consent placed second to Bentley in the roll of English scholars. Though there are certain similarities between the two, the circumstances of their lives were widely different. Bentley was ambitious and long-lived; as Master of Trinity he reigned, a resourceful and successful tyrant, through many years of strife and litigation. He lived in the full light of publicity, and his high-handed dealings with the Fellows of Trinity, the text of Horace and the poetry of Milton are not forgotten. Porson's life was by worldly standards unsuccessful. He lived in poverty and died early with most of his literary projects unfulfilled; he was without ambition and despised worldly success; finally, he never had the biographer he deserved, and his memory survived only in scraps of anecdote and reminiscence.

The outline of his life can be briefly told.¹ He was born in 1759, the son of a poor weaver, in the Norfolk village of East Ruston. He received his early education in the village school and the vicar's study. Generous patrons, observing his uncommon abilities, sent him to Eton and thence to Trinity College, Cambridge, where he was elected fellow in 1782. Ten years later he lost his fellowship owing to his unwillingness to take holy orders. The statutes of the

1 For a fuller account see my *Richard Porson, A biographical Essay* (1937), which has full bibliographies. I should like to take this opportunity of adding to the list of Porson's writings the letter signed *Urbano Amicior* in *Gentleman's Magazine*, July 1794 (LXIV, p. 593). This is ascribed to Porson in Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, IX, p. 80 note, and is clearly from his pen. It also appears from Kidd's edition of Dawes's *Miscellanea Critica* (1827), p. 116, that the review of Vincent, *On the Greek Verb* in the *Critical Review* (June 1797), p. 169, is by Porson. Further unpublished letters are to be found in the Libraries of Edinburgh University (six letters, of small interest, to William Laing) and Magdalen College, Oxford (letters to Routh, one of which is printed in part in Middleton, *Dr Routh*, p. 162).

college required that fellows should be ordained within seven years of their proceeding to the M.A. degree. There were two fellowships open to laymen, and one of these fell vacant in 1792, when Porson's period of grace elapsed. The Master of Trinity, Dr Postlethwaite, had promised him this fellowship, but when the time came gave it instead to a relative of his own and suggested to Porson that he should keep his fellowship by taking orders. This Porson's principles and his pride forbade him to do.

When his college had failed him, his friends and admirers, with that willingness to support learning which was common in the eighteenth century, got up a subscription which provided him with an annuity of £100, enough to supply his modest wants. He was also elected to the professorship of Greek in the same year, but in spite of this he lived mainly in London, where he had rooms in the Temple; he worked when he felt in the mood for it, dabbled in radical journalism, and spent long hours drinking in the Cider Cellar in Maiden Lane. In 1806 he was appointed Librarian of the London Institution, but his health, never good, was by now ruined by consistent neglect and by drink and late hours. Two years later he collapsed in the Strand and died.

Those who met Porson were not always favourably impressed.¹ His appearance was squalid, his habits somewhat disgusting; he was not always polite, he was hard to get rid of and he was apt to bore his companions by interminable recitations. Hazlitt saw him once 'dressed in an old rusty black coat with cobwebs hanging to the

1 The following account of Porson by Thomas Campbell, the poet, has not previously been quoted. It is an extract from a letter to Robert Anderson of 1800, and is preserved in manuscript in Edinburgh University Library. 'Porson, the man of Greek, is remarkably witty, full of anecdote, quotation and whim, but so completely closeted in his own conceit, that the conversation and praise of others can find no admission to his audience. He is a pedant of rare originality. Imagine a fleshless, pale figure, with a small black-bearded quizzical chin, a mouth eternally contracting and expanding with some facetious squib from Joe Millar or Aristophanes, a nose arch in meaning as well as shape, dark eyebrows, knitting and closing in harmony with his mouth—a full large brow expressive of genius, and long black greasy hair, with a foul halter of a neckcloth tied over his red under waistcoat in place of his neck. All this with threadbare cassimere raiment over his spare limbs, and a *fine* dusty blue coat, compasses the full length portrait of *Scaliger Porson*.'

skirts of it, and with a large patch of coarse brown paper covering the whole length of his nose, looking for all the world like a drunken carpenter'.¹ Byron, who met him at Cambridge, was highly uncomplimentary. 'Of all the disgusting brutes, sulky, abusive and intolerable, Porson was the most bestial as far as the few times that I saw him went. . . . He used to recite or rather vomit pages of all languages, and could hiccup Greek like a Helot: and certainly Sparta never shocked her children with a grosser exhibition than this man's intoxication.'²

There was, however, an attractive, even a noble, side to his character. He could inspire a feeling of devotion in his friends; not only were they charmed by his wit and his learning; they also revered him for his honesty and independence of character. 'He possessed two qualities', wrote C. J. Blomfield, 'which, though they are not the sole, are yet very essential requisites in the formation of a great character—an utter contempt for money and a religious attachment to truth.'³ His sincerity and honesty were clear to all who knew him, while his indifference to worldly success was proved by his whole career.

With more ambition he might perhaps have achieved a greater name in literature. He was not a mere scholar. He was familiar with English and French literature and had a keen and sensitive love of poetry. 'All the accounts', wrote E. D. Clarke, 'I have heard of this wonderful man for so many years have not raised my expectations high enough to see him without astonishment. . . . So rare is it to find among men the highest attainments in ancient literature, joined to a love of the poetry of yesterday, the most refined genius and almost supernatural intellect.'⁴ Moreover, he had a gift for satire and parody and had at his command a clear and vigorous English style. But apart from a page or two of memorable criticism of Gibbon, some satirical letters to the *Gentleman's Magazine* on Hawkins's *Life of Johnson*, and a number of ephemeral pieces he did nothing in the way of original composition. He was content to devote himself to the ancients. 'I doubt', he said, 'if I could produce any original work

1 *Table Talk. On Coffee House Politicians.*

2 Letter to Murray, Feb. 20, 1818 (Byron, *Letters and Journals*, ed. Prothero (1900), IV, p. 200).

3 *Museum Criticum*, I, p. 397.

4 Otter, *Life of Clarke* (1824), p. 560.

that would command the attention of posterity. I can be known only by my notes; and I am quite satisfied if, three hundred years hence, it shall be said that one Porson lived towards the end of the eighteenth century who did a good deal for the text of Euripides.’¹

Though it is for his work on Euripides that Porson is best known, his earliest interest was Aeschylus. Shortly after taking his degree he began work on an edition, but the project was abandoned when he found that the Cambridge Press required him to keep Stanley’s text unaltered and to reprint all the worthless notes of Pauw. He had hoped too that the Syndics of the Press would pay the expenses of a visit to Florence, where he intended to collate the Medicean manuscript, but these hopes were dashed by the Vice-Chancellor’s pronouncement, ‘Let Mr Porson collect his manuscripts at home’. The work was laid aside until 1792, when, persuaded by his friend Burney, he arranged with some London booksellers for an edition, to consist of text with Latin translation in two octavo volumes, followed by scholia, fragments and notes, to be printed by Foulis of Glasgow. The printing was begun in 1794, but in the next year, without the knowledge of Porson, Foulis published his folio edition from Porson’s text. Porson was naturally annoyed, and after this there was a long delay, for which Foulis and Porson must share the blame.² Finally, in 1806 the booksellers insisted on the publication of the octavo text. ‘It was given to the world’, says Kidd, ‘with his knowledge and after unceasing importunity, with a sort of half-faced consent.’³ The notes, the preface, the scholia, the fragments, which had formed part of the edition as originally planned, never appeared. The 1806 text does not even contain all Porson’s emendations of Aeschylus; two of the most brilliant, those of *Supplices* 987 and *Agamemnon* 1391, were apparently never committed to paper; it was left to Porson’s pupil Blomfield to publish them in the course of a review.⁴

In his early life Porson contributed a good deal to periodicals.⁵

¹ Maltby, *Porsonian* (appended to *Table Talk of Samuel Rogers*, ed. 1856), p. 334.

² See M. L. Clarke in *Notes and Queries* (Oct. 19, 1940).

³ *Tracts and Criticisms*, p. lxi.

⁴ *Edinburgh Review* (Jan. 1810), xv, p. 320 and (Feb. 1812), xix, p. 502.

⁵ Most of his contributions were reprinted by Kidd in *Tracts and Miscellaneous Criticisms of Richard Porson* (1815).

In Maty's *New Review* he reviewed Schutz's Aeschylus (vol. I, part 2), Brunck's Aristophanes, and Huntingford's *Apology for the Monostrophics*.¹ When Maty's *Review* came to an end he contributed occasionally to the *Monthly Review*. Here he reviewed Robertson's *Dissertation on the Parian Chronicle* and Hewlett's *Vindication of the Authenticity of the Parian Chronicle*. The former book, which called in question the authenticity of the Marmor Parium, succeeded in convincing Dr Parr.² Porson, however, had no difficulty in showing the unsoundness of Robertson's arguments and the groundlessness of his suspicions. He also contributed to the *Monthly Review* critiques of Edwards's Plutarch *De Educatione*, and of Payne Knight's *Analytical Essay on the Greek Alphabet*. His notes on Suidas, written in 1787, appeared as an appendix to the Oxford edition of Toup's *Emendationes in Suidam* (1790) which has been mentioned in the previous chapter.

Another work which belongs to Porson's early period is the *Letters to Travis*. Archdeacon Travis was the author of some letters to Gibbon which appeared in the *Gentleman's Magazine* in 1782 and were published separately in 1784. In these he undertook to defend the interpolated verse in the first epistle of St John (v, 7) about the three who bear witness in heaven, which Gibbon had attacked in the course of his *Decline and Fall*. In default of any other champion of sound scholarship Porson replied in a series of letters in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, afterwards reprinted with much additional matter in 1790. Porson had no difficulty in exposing the archdeacon's scholarship. 'Porson's strictures', wrote Gibbon, 'are founded in argument, enriched with learning and enlivened with wit and his adversary neither deserves nor finds any quarter at his hands.'³ The letters are vigorous, polemical, irreverent; sometimes ironic, sometimes playful, and plentifully interspersed with quotations from literature serious and trivial. Their publication did Porson little good; their tone offended the orthodox, and though Gibbon commended them as 'the most acute and accurate piece of criticism which has appeared since the days of Bentley',⁴ the learned world seems to have been little interested; Porson himself is said to have regretted

1 See p. 83.

3 *Autobiography* (ed. 1896), p. 323.

2 Parr's *Works*, I, p. 328.

4 *Ibid.*

the time he spent on theological studies, and he never returned to New Testament criticism.

The year 1792, in which he ceased to be fellow of Trinity, may be regarded as in some degree the turning point in Porson's life. It was a grievous blow to him to be expelled from his university; he never forgot the treatment he had suffered at the hands of Dr Postlethwaite, and retained a certain feeling of grievance, and of bitterness against the comfortable orthodoxy that reigned in Cambridge and in other strongholds of tradition. The blow encouraged his constitutional indolence and inability to carry out his projects. As fellow of Trinity he had looked forward to succeeding to the Greek professorship and restoring the dignity of the chair by giving lectures. When he actually became professor he never lectured, and would excuse himself on the ground that since his income exceeded his expenditure he had no need of lecture fees,¹ or by saying, 'I have thought better on it: whatever originality my lectures might have had, people would have cried out, "We knew all this before".'² In his early life, when preparing his *Aeschylus*, he had corresponded with Ruhnken, writing with the politeness and deference due to an older and distinguished scholar; in his later life foreign scholars who wrote to him generally received no answer. As a young man we may imagine him hard-working, confident of his powers, eager to advance the study of Greek; in his later life we find him dissipating his energies in writing squibs and lampoons, in calligraphic exercises and in drinking. Though he sometimes summoned up the energy to work for days and nights on end, it is not improbable that most of his knowledge of Greek was acquired during the period of his Trinity fellowship, and that thereafter he relied mainly on his marvellous memory.

When it fell to Porson's lot as professor elect to deliver the customary praelection he chose as his subject Euripides, a poet with whom he was more in sympathy than he was with the other tragedians. Five years later, in 1797, he published his edition of the *Hecuba*. This was intended as the first volume of a complete Euripides, but the project was only partially carried out. The *Orestes* appeared in 1798,

¹ Dalzel, *History of the University of Edinburgh*, I, p. 191.

² Maltby, *Porsoniana*, p. 317.

the *Phoenissae* in the next year and the *Medea* in 1801, but there the series ended.

He began his *Hecuba* with a preface in which he discussed the admissibility of anapaests in the tragic senarius and showed that, contrary to what was then generally believed, they were, except in the case of proper names, only allowed in the first foot. His pronouncement aroused Gottfried Hermann, who had published a lengthy treatise on metres and consequently considered himself an authority on the subject, to produce a rival *Hecuba*, in which he maintained that the anapaest was admissible in every foot but the last. Porson replied with a second edition (1802), with a greatly enlarged preface, not expressly directed against Hermann, but refuting his contentions. His well-known epigram after the model of Phocylides was inspired by this controversy:

Νήϊδες ἔσπε μέτρων, ὧ Τεύτονες· οὐχ ὁ μὲν, ὃς δ' οὐ·
Πάντες, πλὴν ἙΡΜΑΝΝΟΣ· ὁ δ' ἙΡΜΑΝΝΟΣ σφόδρα Τεύτων.

The Germans in Greek
Are sadly to seek;
Not five in five score,
But ninety-five more;
All; save only Herman,
And Herman's a German.

The Supplement to the Preface, in the second edition, takes the place of the dissertation on metres which Porson had originally intended to add at the end of his complete Euripides; it contains a discussion of the laws of iambic, trochaic and anapaestic verse, tragic and comic, and includes a formulation of 'Porson's law', the 'law of the final cretic', which forbids a pause in the fifth foot of an iambic senarius after a long syllable. In a note in the first edition he had remarked: 'There occur in the tragic poets very few verses resembling the first verse of the Ion, Ἀτλας ὁ χολκίοισι νώτοις οὐρανόν.'¹ In the second preface he elaborated this; he did not claim that there were no exceptions to the rule, but he showed how few they were and how many of these could be emended. This canon, Porson's most famous discovery, is now familiar to all who learn to write

1 Note on *Hecuba*, l. 343.

Greek verse; that it was unfamiliar even to Porson himself in his earlier days is shown by some undergraduate verses of his that survive, in which, out of seventeen lines, three break the rule he was afterwards to discover.

In the last years of his life Porson produced nothing. The edition of Aristophanes which he was believed to be preparing came to nothing. He spoke of writing a defence of verbal criticism, of completing his Aeschylus, but when his friends urged him to publish he would say, 'I hate and abhor composition.'¹ When he died he left behind him notebooks, scraps of paper and margins of books, filled with his small neat handwriting. The scholars who edited his remains found even more material of value than they had expected, some of it dating from quite early in his life. In particular they found numerous notes on Athenaeus, on whom he had worked throughout his life and for whom he seems to have had a particular affection. The fragments of Attic comedy preserved in Athenaeus gave him plenty of scope for exercising his skill in emendation; he excelled in restoring to sense and metre those fragments of poetry that survived in a corrupt state in late prose writers.

Porson's achievements were limited; he was uninterested in Latin, and even in Greek his work was confined almost entirely to the field of Attic drama. His special strength lay in his insight in metrical matters, his skill in emendation, and his appreciation of the niceties of Attic diction. He carried on the tradition of Bentley and Dawes, of Markland, Heath and Musgrave, but his work, with its combination of brilliance and carefulness, has a quality all of its own. He seemed to be gifted by nature with a sure sense of what an Athenian would have regarded as good Greek. He observes, for instance, that after an oath such as $\nu\eta\ \Delta\iota\alpha$, $\mu\alpha\ \Delta\iota\alpha$, etc., the particle $\gamma\epsilon$ does not follow except with another word interposed. To this rule there are in fact exceptions which do not appear to be the result of textual corruption; but whether the rule is general or universal, the observation of this Attic nicety is typical of Porson. His success in conjectural emendation is beyond question, and is evinced by the number of his emendations that have been accepted and incorporated in our texts. Moreover by the perfection of his critical method he showed the way to other

¹ Kidd, *Tracts and Criticisms*, p. lxix.

scholars, and his influence extended beyond the passages he corrected. Though he did not ignore manuscripts or defy their evidence, *ratio et res ipsa* were for him, as for Bentley, more important. By observation of the given text he was able to discover rules of style and versification and by reference to these to find and to remove textual corruptions. He was careful to support his corrections by relevant citation of parallel passages, and he never indulged in hasty improvisations. Textual criticism with him was an art demanding the utmost care. 'Nihil contemnendum est neque in bello neque in re critica.'¹

He was gifted with an extraordinary memory (he could, it was said, repeat the whole of *Roderick Random* by heart), which gave an impression of effortless ease to his work. No doubt he had worked hard and read widely, but he does not give the impression of being a great student or a man of very great learning. This is no doubt mainly due to his strict attention to what he regarded as his business and his avoidance of all but the relevant. He did not overload his editions with lengthy notes, and in his Euripides he expressly disclaimed any intention of illustrating the subject matter. 'Interpretandi et illustrandi labore, utilissimo sane, supersedendum duxi, partim ne libellus in librum cresceret.'² At the beginning of the *Orestes* he has a lengthy note illustrating the story of Tantalus by a number of quotations, but he shows what he thinks of this type of annotation by his final sentence, 'Nescio, benevole lector, an tuam patientiam hac nota legenda fatigaris; meam certe scribenda fatigavi.'³ His notes are in general brief and economical, couched in fresh and clear Latin, with occasional touches of characteristic humour.

His candour and intellectual honesty are evident throughout all his work. 'Though Bentley's faculty for discovering the truth', wrote Housman, 'has no equal in the history of learning, his wish to discover it was not so strong. Critics like Porson and Lachmann, inferior in εὐστοχία and ἀγχινοία, put him to shame by their serious and disinterested purpose and the honesty of their dealings with themselves.'⁴ Bentley by his misuse of his powers of divination went near to bringing the art of conjectural emendation into disrepute. Porson never forgot that his duty was not to display his own

1 On *Medea*, l. 139.

3 On *Orestes*, l. 5.

2 Preface to *Hecuba*.

4 Manilius, I, p. xviii.

ingenuity but to restore what his author had written. His love of truth made him quick to detect disingenuousness and false pretensions in others and merciless in exposing them. He was, however, scrupulously fair in finding out what others had said before him and in giving credit where it was due, and he readily acknowledged his own mistakes. His standards both for others and for himself were the highest.

Porson's remarkable personality, his sureness of touch and his actual achievements resulted in his exercising a considerable influence on English scholarship, and the fact that he left so much to be published posthumously helped to found a 'Porsonian school' which centred in the Cambridge classicists who edited his remains. The work of these scholars will be reviewed in the next chapter; meanwhile something must be said of the lesser men who were his contemporaries.

Second to Porson, according to his own estimate, was Dr Parr. The Reverend Samuel Parr (1747-1825) was a considerable figure in the literary world of this period and enjoyed a great reputation as a man of learning, though this reputation quickly slumped after his death, and even in 1857 De Quincey found it necessary to explain that he was a different person from his namesake 'Old Parr'. It is impossible to share the admiration, sometimes extravagant, that was accorded to Parr by many of his contemporaries.¹ It is hard, however, not to feel some affection for this egotistic, pompous, convivial character, with his polysyllabic conversation, his pipe and his wig, his love of splendour and comfort, his violent whiggery and his generous heart. He has a place in this chapter only by courtesy, for he contributed nothing to Greek scholarship, and it is hardly to be expected that others should accept without further evidence his own estimate of himself. He was certainly a man of wide reading; he also had command of a pompous flowery Latin style which had its admirers; but his judgment and critical abilities were not strong, and it would be hard to maintain even that he could have attained eminence

¹ Some good specimens of Parriolatry may be found in E. H. Barker's *Parriana*. In connection with the remark 'Porson first, Burney third', Barker protests that Parr surely cannot have intended to put himself below Porson (I, p. 521). In connection with an inscription by Parr (he was famous for his Latin inscriptions) Barker writes to S. Butler: 'Let us have as many pieces from the Colossus as we can—to be preserved with as much sanctity as the bones of any Catholic Saint' (Butler MSS. I, p. 409).

in pure scholarship if he had applied himself wholly to it. He probably did most service to learning as a teacher, not only in his early days as headmaster, but also in his parsonage at Hatton, where he resided for forty years and where many young men, including W. S. Landor, came to study under him.

Charles Burney (1757-1817) has more claim than Parr to consideration as a scholar. He was the son of his namesake, the historian of music, and the brother of Fanny Burney. From Charterhouse he went to Caius, but his Cambridge career was cut short when he was detected removing books from the University Library.¹ Later in life he was able to indulge his passion for collecting in a more innocent way; he acquired an enormous and valuable library, which was bought for the British Museum after his death. After leaving Cambridge he continued his education at Aberdeen, where he entered King's College, and took his degree in 1781. He returned to London to work as a schoolmaster; after assisting in schools at Highgate and Chiswick he set up a school of his own at Hammersmith in 1786 and in 1793 moved to Greenwich. Late in life, in 1807, he took holy orders, and died a Prebendary of Lincoln and the possessor of a variety of academic degrees.

In addition to running a successful private school Burney was also a frequent contributor to periodicals, and for a time editor of the *London Magazine*. Consequently he was forced to give up some of his early scholarly projects, such as that which Bentley had also formed and never fulfilled, of collecting all the fragments of Greek tragedy.² Nor was he able to carry out his plans for editions of Photius and Terentianus Maurus.³ He won his reputation as a scholar with some weighty reviews of learned works, for example of Huntingford's *Monostrophics*, of Glasse's translation of *Samson Agonistes*, and of Wakefield's *Diatribes*. In these he is said to have been helped by Porson, who was a close friend of his, and there were those who believed that such merits as his scholarship possessed were due to his association with Porson.⁴ George Burges had been told by Dr Goodall

1 Gonville and Caius Biographical Register.

2 Parr's *Works*, vii, p. 390.

3 *Ibid.* i, pp. 725, 730.

4 See *Church of England Quarterly Review*, v, p. 415. Maltby, *Porsoniana*, p. 319.

that all the main parts of Burney's reviews were written by Porson,¹ and there is probably something in this charge. At any rate it is certain that he had a hand in the review of Glasse's *Samson*.² Porson was willing enough to help his friends and not jealously anxious to guard his literary property. He seems, however, to have felt occasionally a certain impatience with Burney, as when, after answering a number of his questions, he exclaimed: 'Really before people become schoolmasters they ought to get up their Greek thoroughly, for they never learn anything more of it afterwards.'³

Apart from contributions to periodicals Burney was responsible for *Remarks on the Greek Verses of Milton*, appended to Warton's edition of 1791; an Appendix to Scapula's *Greek Lexicon*, 1789; *Epistolae Ineditae Ricardi Bentleii*, 1807; *Tentamen de Metris Aeschyli*, 1809; and Philemon's *Lexicon Technologicum*, 1812. The *Tentamen* is the most important of his works, and one that had engaged his leisure hours for many years. Porson's metrical studies had scarcely touched the tragic choruses; Burney ventures into this field and attempts to reduce Aeschylus's lyric metres to a system. He finds that almost all his rhythms are based on the antispast, of which he discovers sixty-one varieties. In printing the Aeschylean chorus he gives the usual scansion, but he has a number of innovations to make in arrangement and resorts to a certain amount of transposition and alteration in the interests of metre. The *Tentamen* seems to have been well received,⁴ but since then editors and metricians have proposed new schemes, and Burney's labours are forgotten.

Burney's reputation had declined somewhat by the time of his death. Elmsley, however, rated him higher than some did. He thought of him as 'the Copernicus of our art; very inferior indeed to Galileo Porson, but still the first man who put us on the right scent.'⁵

Contemporary with Porson and Burney but isolated by tempera-

1 Barker, *Literary Anecdotes*, II, p. 18.

2 Parr's *Works*, I, p. 726.

3 Maltby, *Porsonianana*, p. 319. In a letter to Burney of 1789 Porson has to explain the difference between ἀνέβη and ἀνέβησε (Clarke, *Richard Porson*, p. 116).

4 See reviews by Dobree (*Classical Journal* (1810), II, p. 643) and Blomfield (*Edinburgh Review* (May 1811), p. 152).

5 Butler, *Life of Samuel Butler*, I, p. 146.

ment and circumstances from the rest of the learned world was Gilbert Wakefield. He was born in 1756, took his degree from Jesus College, Cambridge, in 1776, and became fellow of his college soon afterwards. He took deacon's orders, but soon adopted unitarian views and gave up his clerical office. From 1779 to 1783 he was tutor at the nonconformist academy at Warrington, and later for a short time held a similar position at Hackney Academy. Throughout his life he produced numerous writings,¹ on religion and politics as well as on classical literature. He never concealed his radical opinions; he regarded the existing government as 'that bond of iniquity, which must be loosed before social happiness can be secured', and he openly expressed his sympathy with the French Revolution. Under Pitt's repressive regime such sentiments were likely to bring him into trouble; in 1799 as a result of a rash pamphlet directed against the Bishop of Llandaff he was convicted of seditious libel and sent for two years to Dorchester Gaol. He died in 1801 shortly after his release and partly as a result of the privations of prison life.

'Wakefield', wrote Crabb Robinson, 'was a political fanatic. He had the pale complexion and mild features of a saint, was a most gentle creature in domestic life, and a very amiable man; but when he took part in political or religious controversy his pen was dipped in gall.'² To those who know him only from his writings his personality does not seem very attractive. One would like to be able to sympathise with this radical martyr, but one's sympathy is checked by his vanity and querulousness, and by his constant protestations of his own merits and misfortunes. Even when writing works of learning he boasts of his devotion to freedom and truth, and complains of his ill health and poverty, or his lack of an Eton education.³ He was provoked to attack Porson by resentment at not being mentioned in the latter's *Hecuba*, and openly gave this as his reason for writing.⁴ On small points of scholarship he was as strong in his partisanship as on questions of religion and politics. As Porson said, he was as violent against Greek accents as against the Trinity, and

1 The list in Appendix E of his *Memoirs* (1804) contains fifty-three items. He also contributed to periodicals.

2 Crabb Robinson, *Diary* (ed. Sadler), I, p. 56.

3 *Diatribæ Extemporalis*, p. 39.

4 *Ibid.*

he breaks out in absurd fury against the N ephelcusticon: 'At enim te finalis N! cum tua importunitate magnus perdat Jupiter.'¹

His memoirs, first published in 1792,² are disappointing. More interesting is his correspondence with Charles James Fox,³ which began with his dedication of his Lucretius to Fox and continued during his sojourn in Dorchester Gaol. Fox felt the sympathy of a Whig aristocrat for a scholar and a lover of liberty, and took no offence even when Wakefield, commiserating with him on his shooting accident, took occasion to rebuke him for engaging in field sports.⁴ The letters are mainly on classical subjects; Fox, while showing due deference to his correspondent's learning, is ready to join issue with him on questions of scholarship, and generally shows himself superior in taste and judgment to the professional scholar.

Wakefield's chief claim to fame as a scholar rests on his Lucretius, but he did not neglect the Greek classics. In his *Tragoediarum Delectus* (1794) he edited six Greek plays with original notes. Between 1789 and 1795 the five parts of his *Silva Critica* appeared; the publication was begun by the Cambridge Press, but alarmed, so Wakefield believed, by his unorthodoxy, the Syndics refused to continue after the first three parts.⁵ The *Silva Critica* is a miscellany of observations, mainly on the Scriptures, which he illustrates from the classical authors, his idea being to attract classical scholars to the study of the Bible and to encourage a more literary and less theological point of view in biblical scholarship. Other publications of his which concern Greek literature are an edition of Bion and Moschus (1795), the *Diatrise Extemporalis* against Porson's *Hecuba* (1797), a letter to Jacob Bryant on the Trojan War (1797), a translation of select essays

1 *Diatrise Extemporalis*, p. 25. He objected to the addition of N *metri gratia* before a consonant, on the ground that the metrical ictus was sufficient to lengthen the syllable.

2 Reissued in 1804, with an additional volume by J. T. Rutt and Arnold Wainewright.

3 *Correspondence of the late Gilbert Wakefield B.A. with the late Right Hon. Charles James Fox*. 1813. Also in *Memorials and Correspondence of Charles James Fox* (ed. Lord John Russell), vol. iv.

4 Letter xxiii.

5 Wakefield's friend Robert Tyrwhitt, brother of Thomas, financed the last two parts.

of Dio Chrysostom (1800), and a dissertation on Greek hexameter metre published in 1801 under the title *Noctes Carcerianae*. The title of this last work shows that Wakefield's pen was not idle in prison; he also occupied himself in confinement with preparing a Greek-English lexicon, but the lack of support and the difficulties of the task made him abandon it.

'The notes of Mr Wakefield', said Porson, writing of the edition of Lucretius, 'are indeed very numerous and various; philological, critical, illustrative, political; such as he always pours forth with a facility which judgment sometimes limps after in vain.'¹ All Wakefield's writings were characterised by hastiness and lack of self-criticism. His *Diatribæ Extemporalis* against Porson's *Hecuba* was completed in a few hours.² His more substantial works were written with equal speed and carelessness. He explained complacently that the 'constitutional ardour which will not suffer me to dwell long on the same object' excused the 'unavoidable inaccuracies' in his work.³ Apart from mere inaccuracies his haste resulted in his publishing many unnecessary conjectures and many that were extremely bad. Yet his independence and his active mind could not fail to hit the mark sometimes, and however shocking his methods and manners may be, his bold improvisation did produce some successful results.

Oxford produced no scholar of the first rank between Tyrwhitt and Elmsley. In spite of considerable industry and an early start Thomas Burgess (1756-1837) achieved nothing of any real importance. He went up to Corpus from Winchester in 1775, took his degree in 1778, was fellow of his college and tutor until he abandoned an academic for a clerical career. He was bishop of St David's from 1803 to 1825 and of Salisbury from 1825 to his death.

In his early life he was ambitious to shine as a scholar, and while still an undergraduate he re-edited Burton's *Pentalogia*, with a new preface and index. Immediately after taking his degree he began to prepare a new edition of Dawes's *Miscellanea Critica*; this appeared in 1781 with notes by the editor occupying an appendix of 185 pages. Tyrwhitt contributed to those notes and encouraged the young

¹ *British Critic* (May 1801), xvii, p. 454. The review was believed to have been in part by Porson, and the sentence quoted sounds like his composition.

² Wakefield, *Memoirs* (1804), II, p. 100.

³ *Ibid.* I, p. 235.

scholar in other ways, though he advised against Burgess's proposal to found and edit a quarterly classical journal.¹ In 1787 Burgess travelled on the continent and met the leading scholars of the day, Ruhnken, Wytttenbach, Heyne and Villoison. He made a favourable impression on the Dutch scholars,² and they continued to correspond with him after his return to England. It was through him that arrangements were made for the publication of Wytttenbach's edition of Plutarch's *Moralia* by the Oxford University Press. In 1788 he published under the title *Initia Homerica* a selection of passages from Homer with Greek prose paraphrases, mostly from inedited manuscripts.³ He was also responsible for the production in 1792 and 1797 of two parts of a *Museum Oxoniense Literarium*, which consisted of notes and emendations by various scholars, English and foreign, and *variae lectiones* and *anecdota* from manuscript sources. It was he too who supervised the posthumous publication of Tyrwhitt's edition of Aristotle's *Poetics*, and his miscellaneous *Notes and Conjectures*.

In his later years Burgess devoted himself to his episcopal duties and to writing on religious questions. In 1815, however, he entered into a controversy on the digamma, and in various pamphlets of his later years he attempted to defend the spurious verse in I John which Porson had dealt with in his *Letters to Travis*. These writings would no doubt have confirmed Porson in the low opinion he formed when alive of Burgess's scholarship; and perhaps Burgess in trying to depreciate Porson after his death was subconsciously repaying him for the contemptuous opinion he had expressed of the promising young scholar of the 1780's.⁴

Verse composition was not an occupation much indulged in by the scholars of this period. The universities had given up the practice, usual in the early eighteenth century, of greeting royal births, deaths and marriages with volumes of congratulatory or mournful verse. Dawes, as we have seen, abandoned his project of translating *Paradise Lost* into Greek hexameters, and none of the leading critics after him

1 Harford, *Life of Burgess*, p. 68.

2 *Ibid.* p. 114 f.

3 A new edition, with Pope's translation of the relevant passages, and Heyne's notes, appeared in 1820.

4 See Maltby, *Porsoniana*, p. 324. Porson met Burgess at Oxford in 1785 (*Life of Burgess*, p. 102).

attempted anything in this line. The increased knowledge of Greek idiom and prosody made scholars less inclined to attempt what they could not do perfectly; such productions as Duport's translation into Homeric verse of the books of Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon or Barnes's of the book of Esther would hardly have satisfied a mid- or late eighteenth-century critic. Such pieces of Greek verse as saw the light were the works of lesser scholars outside the main tradition.

Two works which aroused considerable admiration at the time were Glasse's translations of Mason's *Caractacus* and of Milton's *Samson*, each forming a Greek play complete with chorus. George Henry Glasse was a Christ Church man with a remarkable facility for composition in Greek and Latin; he published his *Caractacus* in 1781 at the age of twenty and *Samson* seven years later. He took holy orders, ran through a large fortune, and committed suicide in 1809. His *Caractacus* was greeted with enthusiasm. Dr Johnson and Dr Parr were among its admirers, and at their suggestion he went on to attempt *Samson*. This too was well received. 'It is a stupendous work,' wrote Parr, '... such a mass of Greek verse, constructed with such precision and expressed with such elegance never appeared in Europe since the revival of learning.'¹ But there were dissentient voices from those who knew more of Greek metre than Dr Parr. Charles Burney, with Porson at his elbow, pointed out numerous faults of diction and metre in a lengthy review,² though even Burney considered the *Samson* 'an astonishing performance'.³

Those who published Greek verses in the 1780's had to be prepared for criticism. George Isaac Huntingford, who in 1783 published some original Greek lyrics under the title ΜΕΤΡΙΚὰ ΤΙΝΑ ΜΟΝΟΣΤΡΟΦΙΚὰ, found himself criticised in detail in the *Monthly Review*.⁴ In the next year he produced an *Apology for the Monostrophics*, with some additional verses; this was reviewed at length by Burney in the *Monthly Review*,⁵ and more briefly but no less severely by Porson in Maty's *Review*.⁶ Huntingford indeed invited criticism by his

¹ Parr's *Works*, vii, p. 637.

² *Monthly Review* (July, Aug. and Sept. 1789).

³ Harford, *Burgess*, p. 132.

⁵ April, June, Aug., Sept. 1785.

⁴ June, Aug. 1783.

⁶ Porson, *Tracts and Criticisms*, p. 48.

expressed principle that 'modern imitators of the ancient Greeks may adopt anything and everything of which examples (though scattered here and there) may be found'.

In 1785 William Cooke, Professor of Greek at Cambridge, published a translation of Gray's *Elegy* into Theocritean hexameters, not without false quantities and other mistakes. This set a fashion, and within the next dozen years no fewer than five such versions were published. T. J. Mathias, the satirist of the day, referred to this fashion in his *Pursuits of Literature*.

Old Norbury starts and with the *seventh form* boys
In weeds of Greek the church-yard's peace annoys,
With classic Weston, Charley Coote and Tew,
In *dismal dance* about the mournful yew.¹

Norbury's version appeared in 1793, those of Weston and Coote in 1794 and that of Tew in 1795. A further attempt was made in 1796 by John Plumptre, who had previously translated Pope's *Messiah* into Greek, and added *Lycidas* in the following year. Most of these versifiers were Etonians, and none of them, with the possible exception of Weston, who was the author of a collection of conjectures on Hermesianax and other Greek writers, had any pretensions to more than a conventional polite learning.²

Porson had a low opinion of most modern Greek and Latin verse and disapproved of its publication. The pieces in *Musae Etonenses* he described as 'trash, fit only to be put behind the fire'. He, and his followers too, 'chose rather to read good Greek than to write bad'. It was only later, in the nineteenth century, that verse making became once more a popular occupation among scholars. By the time of *Sabrinæ Corolla* the researches of Porson and his school into Attic metre and diction had become part of the general knowledge, and it was possible even for 'seventh form boys', as Mathias would have called them, to produce verse a good deal nearer to that of ancient Greece than had been possible for men like Glasse in the eighteenth century.

¹ *Pursuits of Literature*, 3rd dialogue, l. 9.

² Cooké, Norbury, Tew and Plumptre were all products of Eton and King's. Coote was Dean of Kilfenora.

CHAPTER VII

Greek Scholarship from Porson to 1830

‘He would often remark, with exulting pleasure, that there is now even *more* Greek learning in this country than formerly; and that many Greek scholars have appeared in later times who in his youthful days would have been regarded as prodigies.’

FIELD, *Life of Dr Parr*

AFTER PORSON'S DEATH IN 1808 those scholars who had known him and learnt from him developed into a recognisable school, which centred in three young fellows of Trinity, Dobree, Blomfield and Monk. They were admirably qualified for the task set them by their college of publishing Porson's remains; they were competent and accurate, and well versed in the metrical and critical science of their master. Those who were outside the group thought them arrogant and exclusive. According to Dr Parr, Porson had left his disciples ‘scraps of Greek and cartloads of insolence’,¹ and Parr's old pupil and friend Samuel Butler shared his opinion. These two dissociated themselves from the Porsonians; ‘namesake,’ wrote Parr to Butler, ‘you and I belong to no critical gang.’² Elmsley too, though his scholarship was of Porsonian type and quality, was outside the Porsonian circle. He was an Oxford man, and had few personal associations with the Cambridge school. We find him writing to Butler: ‘I wish you would persuade some of the *Porsonulettes* of Cambridge to review my *Oedipus Tyrannus*. . . . Having no acquaintance with *ces gens-là*, I cannot ask them to do it. I wish it because I know they are in possession of the scriptures as well as the oral tradition of Porsonianism. With his mantle they possess a double portion of his spirit.’³

Another recognisable group of scholars in the early nineteenth century is that of A. J. Valpy, the printer and editor who produced the *Classical Journal* and other learned publications. Valpy and his collaborators, among whom E. H. Barker was conspicuous for his prolific output, were characterised by a zeal for the classics and a

1 Butler, *Life of Samuel Butler*, I, p. 66.

2 Parr's *Works*, VII, p. 367.

3 Butler, *op. cit.* I, p. 71.

capacity for accumulating miscellaneous learning rather than by judgment or critical acuteness. Their periodical the *Classical Journal* was founded in 1810, and continued until 1829 as a receptacle for all sorts of learned matter, emendations, archaeological communications, essays, prize poems, original Latin and Greek poetry, anecdotes and republications of earlier articles and pamphlets. The Porsonian school also had its periodical, the *Museum Criticum*, which reflected the severer standards of Cambridge scholarship. The *Classical Journal* looked on it with jealous suspicion as an unwelcome rival,¹ while the *Museum Criticum* regarded the *Journal* with contemptuous indifference.

Of the three Trinity men, Monk, Blomfield and Dobree, it would not now be considered that Monk was the best scholar. Yet he was chosen, at the age of twenty-five, to succeed Porson as Professor of Greek.² He took his degree in 1804 and was elected fellow in the next year; as tutor of his college he was an energetic and effective teacher; in university affairs he was an advocate of reform within and a champion against attacks from without. In 1822 he was made Dean of Peterborough. The dignity of his new position demanded that he should become Doctor of Divinity, but the statutes of the university laid down that the Professor of Greek should not be a doctor. Monk hoped to be able to retain his professorship with his deanery and his doctorate; he endeavoured to show that whereas doctors could not become professors, professors could become doctors, but this interpretation did not prove convincing, and he relinquished his professorship.³ He subsequently became Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

Monk is chiefly remembered for his able *Life of Bentley*, which was published in 1830. In earlier life, he had collaborated with Blomfield in editing Porson's *Adversaria* and in the production of the

1 'There is a set of men in your university who . . . even extend their malignity to whatever my son publishes or even prints . . . they have failed in their scheme to upset the *Classical Journal*' (R. Valpy to Parr, 1816; Parr's *Works*, VII, p. 568). See also *Classical Journal*, XXI, p. 166, XXIV, p. 433 f.

2 According to Pryme (*Autobiographic Recollections*, p. 151) the electors were influenced by the fact that Monk had won the Chancellor's Medal, whereas Dobree had not troubled to sit for the examination.

3 Winstanley, *Unreformed Cambridge*, p. 118.

Museum Criticum. As professor at Cambridge he edited two plays of Euripides, the *Hippolytus* in 1811 and the *Alcestis* in 1816. He evidently thought of himself as carrying on Porson's work; he took up Euripides where Porson had left off, and probably had ideas at first of editing all the rest of the plays. But his episcopal duties and bad eyesight combined to make this impossible; belatedly he published two more plays from his episcopal palace, the *Iphigenia in Aulis* in 1840 and the *Iphigenia in Tauris* in 1845. As an editor he was a follower of Porson, but a follower from afar;¹ he had his caution and his accuracy, but lacked his more uncommon gifts. His notes provided some justification for those who complained of the dullness and dryness of the Porsonian school of criticism.

Charles James Blomfield, Monk's friend and associate, was a scholar of more importance. He was born in 1786 and educated at Bury St Edmunds and Trinity; in 1806 he won the Craven scholarship, and Porson, who examined him, pronounced him 'a very pretty scholar'.² He was elected a fellow of his college in 1809. In 1824 he was appointed Bishop of Chester and four years later was translated to London, where he proved himself an active and efficient diocesan and a great builder of churches.

His industry and competence were as marked in scholarship as in church affairs. He was regarded in his college as a not unworthy successor of Porson, and the consciousness of his abilities made him somewhat arrogant and overbearing. 'Blomfield', wrote T. S. Hughes to Samuel Butler in 1810, 'has been so flattered and caressed at Cambridge that he is now quite spoiled, and is much disliked by a great part of the University.'³ He was a severe reviewer, with an ironical manner, which, in conjunction with his superior scholarship, proved highly annoying to his victims. The enmity he aroused found expression in the pamphlets directed against him by Samuel Butler and E. H. Barker, and in the acrimonious attacks of George Burges in the *Classical Journal*.⁴

In the fifteen years from his election to a Trinity fellowship to his

1 See Hermann, *Opuscula*, VI, p. 96.

2 Blomfield, *Memoir of C. J. Blomfield* (1863), I, p. 8.

3 Butler, *Life of Samuel Butler*, I, p. 59.

4 Vol. XXI, p. 366; vol. XXII, p. 204; vol. XXIV, p. 402.

elevation to the episcopate he worked with great industry on Greek literature. He devoted himself in particular to Aeschylus, intending to produce a complete edition of the plays and fragments. He completed five out of the seven plays, *Prometheus* (1810), *Septem* (1812), *Persae* (1814), *Agamemnon* (1818), and *Choephoroi* (1824).¹ He published an edition of Callimachus in 1815 and edited the fragments of Sappho, Alcaeus and Stesichorus in the *Museum Criticum*. Besides sharing in the publication of Porson's *Adversaria* he was largely responsible for the conduct of the *Museum Criticum*, to which he contributed several papers and a large number of reviews.² Before the foundation of the *Museum* he contributed occasionally to the *Classical Journal*, and he often reviewed works of learning in the *Edinburgh* and the *Quarterly*.³

His work was based on extensive learning and an appreciation of the work of previous critics, in particular of Porson. His editions of Aeschylus, clearly printed in the new Porson Greek type and containing valuable glossaries in addition to the ordinary annotation, were of considerable use in facilitating the reading of a poet who was becoming more popular as he became more intelligible. Hermann considered that Blomfield had no sense of Aeschylus's poetic power and was apt to reduce his language to the ordinary and prosaic.⁴ It may be so; and no doubt it is true that Blomfield lacked the emendatory skill of his master Porson or his contemporary Dobree. Yet if he is not to be placed in the first class of scholars, his supreme efficiency puts him at the very head of the second.

Peter Paul Dobree was born in Guernsey in 1782 and educated at Reading School and Trinity; he took his degree in 1804, was elected fellow in 1806 and for the last two years of his life, from 1823 to 1825, held the professorship of Greek. He lived a quiet uneventful life and was little known outside his small circle of acquaintance. He visited the continent more than once; in 1815 he was in Leyden, and impressed his Dutch hosts by the calm indifference with which he

1 His notes on the *Eumenides* are to be found in Linwood's edition (1844).

2 All the reviews in no. 2 are his work.

3 For a list of his contributions to periodicals see Luard in *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology* (1858), IV, p. 196.

4 *Opuscula*, VI, p. 96.

regarded the exciting events of that year; even the battle of Waterloo did not disturb his studies.¹

In 1805 Dobree had made the acquaintance of Porson, and had soon become his intimate friend and disciple. 'Of all Porson's scholars,' it was said, 'none so nearly resembles his great master.'² It was in scholarship that the resemblance was most marked; but Dobree also shared with Porson, or perhaps acquired from him, a knowledge of French literature and a taste for mathematical problems. He does not appear to have imitated Porson's less reputable characteristics; he was a clergyman, and, according to all accounts, virtuous, modest and gentle.

He was naturally marked out for the task of collecting Porson's notes. Ill health prevented him from assisting with the *Adversaria* volume of 1812, but in 1820 he published Porson's notes on Aristophanes, including a text of the *Plutus*, part of which had been prepared by Porson. To the *Plutus* and elsewhere in the volume Dobree added notes of his own, mainly concerning manuscript readings. Two years later he published Photius, as transcribed by Porson some years earlier from the Galean MS. Apart from these works of piety, and from some contributions to periodicals, Dobree produced nothing in his lifetime; he had, however, made good use of the margins of his books, and after his death his notes were published copiously, but none too accurately,³ by his successor in the professorship, James Scholefield. Two volumes of *Adversaria* appeared in 1831 and 1833; these were followed in 1834 by a volume of notes on inscriptions and a reissue of the rhetorical lexicon, published from a Cambridge MS., which Dobree had appended to Porson's Photius.

Of Porson's Cambridge pupils Dobree was the most akin to his master in fastidious accuracy, skill in emendation and appreciation of the niceties of Greek diction. He shared in Porson's chief interests, and notes on Euripides, Aristophanes and Athenaeus occupy the main part of the second volume of the *Adversaria*. He did not, however, confine himself to these authors; the lengthier first volume is occupied with his notes on the Greek prose writers. He devoted

1 Bake, *Scholica Hypomnemata*, II, p. iv.

2 Hare, in *Philological Museum*, I, p. 205.

3 See Wyse, Isaeus, Preface, p. lix.

especial care to the orators, and subjected them to the same critical attention that had hitherto been mainly directed to the dramatists. Among the Attic orators he had a particular liking for Lysias. He chose him as the subject of his praelection as candidate for the Greek professorship,¹ and his comments on the various orations printed in the *Adversaria* show how much he admired this writer.² In Lysias Dobree found that same 'nativa venustas et inaffectedata simplicitas' that delighted Porson in Euripides.³

The name of Thomas Kidd (1770-1850) deserves mention among the pupils of Porson; he was rather older than Blomfield and the rest, and he was not distinguished as a critic or an emendator, but he yielded to none in admiration for Porson, and played his part in the preservation of his work and his memory.

He was a graduate of Trinity, but was never fellow of his college. At one time he was a country curate in Essex taking pupils in his parsonage.⁴ At the beginning of the nineteenth century he was living in London as assistant master at Merchant Taylors;⁵ later he was headmaster successively of King's Lynn, Wymondham and Norwich Grammar Schools. He was a man of great simplicity and innocence. 'An infant in the cradle,' wrote Parr, 'or an adult in Otaheite would be just as able as poor Kidd to conduct any negotiation for worldly affairs.'⁶ He is the 'modern Parson Adams' of whom a character sketch is given in Beloe's *Sexagenarian*.⁷ Like Parson Adams he was constantly involved in unmerited misfortune; on one occasion we hear of his being confined in Cambridge Gaol, 'punished not for rioting, but for the extravagance of his wife'.⁸

He resembled Parson Adams also in his devotion to Greek; and his admiration for classical scholars was as strong as his love for the classics. He gave his son the names of Richard Bentley Porson; and his writings are full of expressions of veneration for the great critics and of sorrow at their deaths. Porson in particular he idolised.

¹ Most of the lecture is about the *Epitaphius*, which Dobree, following Valckenaer, showed to be spurious.

² *Adversaria*, I, pp. 192-3.

³ See Porson, *Adversaria*, p. 11.

⁴ Parr's *Works*, VIII, p. 107.

⁵ MS. note in Luard's copy of Beloe's *Sexagenarian* in Cambridge University Library.

⁶ Parr's *Works*, VIII, p. 107.

⁷ Vol. II, p. 138.

⁸ Butler MSS. II, p. 166.

'It was amusing,' says Maltby, 'to see Kidd in Porson's company; he bowed down before him with the veneration due to some being of a superior nature, and seemed absolutely to swallow every word that dropped from his mouth.'¹ Porson in return seems to have treated his guileless admirer with forbearance, and even admitted him to be 'a very pretty scholar'.

Encouraged by Porson, Kidd undertook a new edition of Dawes's *Miscellanea Critica*. At one point he lost the manuscript he had prepared for the press, but eventually the work appeared in 1817, and a new and enlarged edition followed ten years later. To Kidd also we owe the useful collection of Porson's *Tracts and Miscellaneous Criticisms*, published in 1815, with a curious biographical preface. Another similar work of piety was his collection of Ruhnken's minor works published in 1807 under the title *Opuscula Ruhnkeniana*.² Kidd was not a good editor, and he must have been the despair of his printers. He is prolific in Addenda, Additamenta and Auctaria, and even in his indices he breaks out into quaint irrelevancies. He suffered from an inability to arrange or omit. Whatever there may be of value in his notes on Dawes is swamped by a confused mass of erudition; Kidd can perhaps claim to have established a record with one of his footnotes which extends to twenty pages of close print and double columns. His publications are among the curiosities of classical scholarship; his unself-conscious devotion to learning reminds us of J. E. B. Mayor, but his eccentricities of style are unparalleled. His is not an important figure in the history of scholarship, but it is a pleasant one to dwell on in this age when a brisk and professional efficiency reigns among classical as among other scholars.

Somewhat detached, as we have seen, from the Porsonian school was Samuel Butler (1774-1839), an alumnus of Rugby and St John's, headmaster for many years of Shrewsbury, and lastly Bishop of Lichfield. Something has already been said of his success as a school-master. As a scholar he was less successful, for the Cambridge Aeschylus of 1809-16 remains a monument of vain labour. It was not Butler, however, but the Cambridge Press that was responsible

¹ *Porsoniana*, p. 325.

² For a list of Kidd's contributions to periodicals see *D.N.B.*

for the plan of the work. Porson had refused to carry out this plan, which involved reprinting literally Stanley's out-of-date text, and including his notes and those of subsequent scholars. Butler also would have preferred to edit Aeschylus anew without restrictions, but when he undertook the work he was a young man and unable to assert his authority against that of the aged Dr Apthorp, to whose daughter he was engaged.¹

The Aeschylus when completed consisted of four expensive quarto volumes, containing an ill-arranged assortment of miscellaneous material. Each play was followed by three sets of scholia, Stanley's Latin version, Stanley's notes (enlarged from his manuscripts) and two commentaries, one critical and one philological, comprising most of what had been said on Aeschylus since the revival of learning. The first two volumes were severely reviewed by Blomfield in the *Edinburgh Review*.² His criticisms were certainly justified, but they were not expressed in that tone of respectful diffidence which is expected from a young man of twenty-three. The articles, we are told, were regarded as a kind of challenge from the younger to the older generation of scholars.³ Dr Parr was indignant, and with his encouragement Butler sat down to compose a 'Letter to the Rev. C. J. Blomfield A.B.', whom he affected to dissociate from the anonymous reviewer. The pamphlet is, as Mayor says, 'written in a tone of somewhat dreary pleasantry',⁴ and makes much of Blomfield's youth and the arrogance of the Porsonians. Blomfield wisely did not reply. For a time Butler continued to regard him with suspicion and dislike, though later they were reconciled and became good friends. Blomfield subsequently described Butler, no doubt with justice, as 'a really learned as well as amiable man, but his forte did not lie in verbal criticism'.⁵

1 Butler, *Life of Dr Samuel Butler*, I, p. 160.

2 Oct. 1809, xv, p. 152; Jan. 1810, xv, p. 315; Feb. 1812, xix, p. 477.

3 Blomfield, *Memoir of C. J. Blomfield*, I, p. 14.

4 Baker, *History of St John's College*, II, p. 911. Elmsley, however, recommended it 'to all admirers of Greek criticism and English wit' (*Edinburgh Review* (Nov. 1810), xvii, p. 212).

5 Blomfield, *op. cit.* I, p. 15. Butler also wrote *A Sketch of Modern and Ancient Geography for the Use of Schools* (1813) and contributed some notes to Peile's *Agamemnon* (1839) and *Choephoroi* (1840), signed S. L. (Samuel Lichfield).

We now turn to that group of scholars mentioned at the beginning of the chapter which centred round Valpy and the *Classical Journal*. Abraham John Valpy (1787-1854) was the son of Richard Valpy, the successful headmaster of Reading School and compiler of Latin and Greek grammars and of selections for school use. After taking his degree at Pembroke College, Oxford, he started on his career as printer and editor, with the ambition of becoming a modern Aldus or Stephanus. He was a successful business man, but his enterprises did not meet with the approval of the stricter classical scholars. His reissue of the Delphin Latin classics in 141 volumes was not welcomed by those who thought that ancient writers should be read in the best available text.¹ The new edition of Stephanus's *Thesaurus* which he published started with a large number of subscribers, but at the outset its reputation and that of its editor, E. H. Barker, were blasted by Blomfield's review in the *Quarterly*. The *Classical Journal*, though it contained a few contributions by good scholars, and showed a laudable zeal for ancient literature, was on the whole a second-rate production, and no one is likely to consult any of its forty volumes to-day except as a distasteful duty.

Among the more important contributors to the *Journal* was George Burges. He was born in Bengal, probably in 1786,² and educated at Charterhouse and Trinity, taking his degree in 1807. For some years he lived in Cambridge as a private tutor, but he also at various times engaged in other less orthodox activities.³ He ran a coach service up and down the New Road, London; he constructed 'a machine for the aerial conveyance of passengers from Dover to Calais', and invented a new kind of stays which he called 'Corsets à la Vénus'. He was author of a play entitled 'The Son of Erin, or the Cause of the Greeks', with songs the music of which he composed himself, and of a pamphlet advocating the use of native guano. As a result of his inventions and speculations he lost a considerable fortune, and was reduced to keeping a lodging house at Ramsgate. In his last years

1 The editor was George Dyer, Lamb's friend (see *Oxford in Vacation*).

2 According to *Admissions to Trinity College* he was admitted in 1802 aged 18. In his *Troades* (1807) p. xxix he refers to himself as not yet 21. *D.N.B.* gives the date of his birth as 1786 (?).

3 See Boase, *Modern English Biography*, s.v. George Burges.

he was in receipt of a Civil List pension, obtained for him by Blomfield, whom in earlier days he had assailed with bitter accusations of plagiarism and mendacity.

At a very early age, in fact in the year in which he took his degree, Burges published an edition of the *Troades*¹ and aroused great hopes of future achievement as a scholar.² He soon followed this with a small edition of the *Phoenissae* (1809), but proceeded no further with Euripides, though at one time he intended to edit the *Bacchae*, and got as far as preparing the text.³ He turned his attention to Aeschylus, intending to edit all his plays and hoping to rival his enemy Blomfield.⁴ His *Supplices* appeared in 1821, but he met with little encouragement, and, apart from a school edition of the *Prometheus* with English notes (1831), published no more Greek plays. In later life he did some classical hack work, translating Plato and the Greek anthology for Bohn. He died in 1864, having long outlived most of his scholarly contemporaries.

His editions are completely forgotten to-day, though a few of his emendations have found favour with later editors. He was a man of ingenious mind and independent learning. Dobree and Elmsley spoke well of him, the latter calling him 'vir ingenio doctrina et Graecarum literarum amore vix cuiquam secundus';⁵ Bake was impressed by his remarkable familiarity with the ancient scholiasts, lexicographers and grammarians.⁶ But all agreed that he was given to excessive and rash conjectural emendation. On the publication of his *Supplices* the *Museum Criticum* commented, 'Mr Burges has written a new play which he entitles the *Supplices*';⁷ and according to Hermann, who described him as even rasher in conjecture than Bothe, one could scarcely recognise the original poet in his editions.⁸

Most prolific of all the contributors to the *Classical Journal* was the industrious and pathetic Edmund Henry Barker (1788-1839). At Trinity, Cambridge, Barker had a successful undergraduate career,

1 1807, 2nd ed. 1837.

3 *Ibid.*

5 Elmsley, *Bacch. l.c.*; Dobree, *Porsoni Notae in Aristophanem*, Preface, p. v.

See also Bailey, *Hermesianax* (1839), p. xiii.

6 *Scholica Hypomnemata*, II, p. ix.

7 II, p. 530.

2 Elmsley, *Bacchae*, Preface, p. 10.

4 Burges, *Supplices*, Preface, p. viii.

8 *Opuscula*, VI, p. 97.

but owing to conscientious scruples against the Thirty-nine Articles never took a degree. Soon after leaving the university he went to reside with Dr Parr at Hatton and remained there for five years acting as Parr's amanuensis (Parr's handwriting was completely illegible). On his marriage he settled at Thetford, and thereafter appended to his name the puzzling letters O.T.N., which signified no honour or academic degree, but merely 'Of Thetford, Norfolk'. While at Thetford he wrote and compiled with the greatest perseverance. He contributed to almost every number of the *Classical Journal*, and used to say that if need be he could fill a whole number himself. Among his publications were classical editions with English notes, a Greek and English lexicon (with George Dunbar), a reprint of Lempriere's *Classical Dictionary*, and a volume entitled *Classical Recreations*. His greatest work was his new edition of Stephanus's *Thesaurus*, completed in 1826 in twelve folio volumes. The devastating review by Blomfield of the first four numbers¹ effectively destroyed Barker's reputation in the learned world of England. Nor did he gain anything by the pathetically ineffective pamphlet *Aristarchus Anti-Blomfieldianus*, with which he replied to his reviewer.² Barker's extravagance in buying books combined with the expenses of a lengthy lawsuit ruined his fortunes, and in 1835 he moved to London, having sold his library, but still sanguine and full of literary projects. His projects failed, and he soon found himself imprisoned for debt. In spite of the generous help of learned men he never recovered his position. After his release from prison in 1838 his affairs became more and more hopelessly involved, and he died in poverty and squalor in 1839. In his misfortunes he preserved the good-humoured equanimity that characterised him throughout life. He continued to form literary plans and to collect anecdotes and newspaper extracts which he wrote out in his careful, round hand. Only at the end did he abandon his literary pursuits and allow himself to be drawn into the underworld.

Barker worked with stolid perseverance. We are told that except when he was asleep his eye was never off a book nor his hand without a pen in it, and the three years he spent on the index to the *Thesaurus*

¹ *Quarterly Review*, XXII, p. 302 f.

² See Monk in *Quarterly Review*, XXIV, p. 376.

were, he said, the happiest of his life.¹ But he was wholly without ability to arrange his matter. In the *Thesaurus* everything that had ever been said on any word was thrown together, and many of the articles were swollen to enormous dimensions by irrelevant dissertations on any subject that arose in the course of the article.² He had no literary gifts, and those 'dissertations on the howling of dogs, on the use of bells among the ancients and on the respect paid to old age' in which he specialised³ were without style or grace. His *Parriana* and *Literary Anecdotes* are occasionally referred to to-day, but even in the humble capacity of collector of literary miscellanea he showed a singular lack of talent. Parr once said to him in a moment of frankness: 'You have read a great deal, you have thought very little, and you know nothing.'⁴

Almost all the scholars hitherto mentioned were Cambridge men, and there is no doubt that Cambridge was the leading university in classical studies in the early nineteenth century. The Oxford Press was more active than that of Cambridge in publishing the classics, but not all the editions which issued from it were such as to enhance the reputation of the university. In 1807 there appeared a Strabo, in two folio volumes, edited by Thomas Falconer, a physician of Bath. Its demerits would doubtless have been known only to scholars, had they not been the occasion for an attack on Oxford and its scholarship by Payne Knight in the *Edinburgh Review*.⁵ The edition was described by Knight as a 'ponderous monument of operose ignorance and vain expense',⁶ and the faulty language of the preface, much of which was hallowed by long academic usage, was pilloried as 'Oxford Latin'. About this time several editions by foreign scholars were published at Oxford. Wytenbach's Plutarch's *Moralia* (1795-1806) was specially undertaken for the Oxford Press; other publications, such as Heyne's Pindar (1807-8) and Brunck's Aristophanes (1810), were reprints of works already published on the continent. These reprints

1 *Memoir* (prefixed to Barker's *Literary Anecdotes*), pp. xix, xxiii.

2 Blomfield calculated on the basis of the first four parts that it would take 70 years to complete and would extend to 50 volumes. The article on ἀγῶμα extended to 139 columns.

3 *Memoir* (prefixed to Barker's *Literary Anecdotes*), p. xxi.

4 Maltby, *Porsoniana*, p. 319.

5 July 1809, xiv, p. 429.

6 p. 441.

helped to supply the demand for complete editions of authors who had previously been little read, or only in out-of-date editions.

Though there was not at Oxford the same flowering of Greek scholarship as at Cambridge, the older university produced a fine critic in Elmsley and a learned and competent scholar in Gaisford. Elmsley left the university without a fellowship and only held office there for the last two years of his life; Gaisford, on the other hand, as Dean of Christ Church, Professor of Greek and delegate of the Press, was essentially the representative of official Oxford scholarship.

Peter Elmsley was born in 1774.¹ From Westminster he passed to Christ Church and took his degree in 1794. At Oxford he was a friend of Southey, who has left no more interesting detail of him than that he was the fattest undergraduate of his time and later became still fatter.² He took holy orders, and from 1798 held the living of Little Horkesley in Essex. However, it was not long before he was able to hand over his duties to a curate and live the life of a gentleman of means, for in 1802 his uncle Peter Elmsley, the bookseller, died, and left him a considerable fortune. He lived for a time in Edinburgh; here he got to know the founders of the *Review*, to which he contributed some articles on matters of Greek scholarship. Later he found its irreligious and Jacobinical tone distasteful and ceased to contribute.³ From Edinburgh he moved to London, and thence to Kent. Finally, in 1817 he settled in Oxford, and for the last two years of his life, from 1823 to 1825, he was Principal of St Alban Hall and Camden Professor of History. He seems to have been a man of attractive character; he was widely learned in other subjects besides Greek, agreeable and witty in conversation, honest and unprejudiced in his views.

Between him and the Cambridge school of Porsonians there was a certain coolness,⁴ but his scholarship was very much in the Porsonian tradition. His work was almost entirely confined to Attic

1 See the *Record of Old Westminster*, and his memorial in Oxford Cathedral. *D.N.B.* gives the date as 1773.

2 Southey's *Life and Correspondence*, III, p. 85, v, p. 21.

3 Butler, *Life of Samuel Butler*, I, p. 88.

4 The Cambridge scholars believed him guilty of filching Porson's emendations. See Appendix II.

drama. He published editions of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* and the *Oedipus Coloneus* (1811 and 1823); of the *Heracleidae* (1813), the *Medea* (1818) and the *Bacchae* (1821); and of the *Acharnians* of Aristophanes. The last he published at Oxford in 1809, but being dissatisfied with it suppressed it soon after publication; it became known, however, through the Leipzig reprint. Elmsley's articles in periodicals were substantial works of scholarship, not without their touches of genial humour. In the *Edinburgh* he reviewed Schweighäuser's *Athenaeus*, Heyne's *Homer*, Blomfield's *Prometheus*, and a reprint of Porson's *Hecuba*;¹ this last review is an elaborate article illustrating and amplifying Porson's metrical canons. In the *Quarterly* he wrote the review of the Oxford edition of Markland's three plays of Euripides,² and in the *Classical Journal* those of Hermann's *Heracles* and *Supplices*.³ To the *Museum Criticum* he contributed notes on the *Lysistrata*, the *Ajax*, the *Medea*, and the *Iphigenia in Tauris*.⁴

Elmsley followed in the steps of Dawes and Porson as an observer of Attic syntax and metre. If, as has been said,⁵ he was too inclined to refer everything to rules and to emend unnecessarily to suit his own rules, this was perhaps a fault he shared with others of the English school. No one will deny his insight into the usage of Attic drama and the learning and good sense with which he applied his observations. According to Hermann he was 'vir natus augendae accuratori Graecae linguae cognitioni', a man of exceptional diligence in the investigation of grammatical questions, free from prejudice and partiality and solely desirous of discovering the truth.⁶

In one respect, in the discovery and use of new manuscript material, Elmsley went beyond his English predecessors. Only Musgrave of earlier editors had used the riches of foreign libraries to a comparable degree. English scholars had for some time been cut off from the continent by the Napoleonic wars and had been unable to add much

1 *Edinburgh Review* (Oct. 1803), III, p. 181; (July 1803), II, p. 308; (Nov. 1810), XVII, p. 211; (Nov. 1811), XIX, p. 64.

2 *Quarterly Review*, VII, p. 442.

3 *Classical Journal*, VIII, pp. 199, 417, IX, p. 49.

4 Vol. I, nos. ii, iii, iv; vol. II, nos. v, vi.

5 Hermann, *Opuscula*, VI, 95.

6 *Adnotationes*, appended to Elmsley's *Medea* (Leipzig, 1822), p. 407.

to the existing body of manuscript material. Elmsley in his later years made several foreign tours and brought back from them a rich store of collations. The winter of 1819-20 he spent in Florence studying the Greek MSS. in the Laurentian Library; he recognised the value of the Codex Laurentianus (L) which is admittedly the best of Sophoclean MSS. and was at one time thought to be the source of all others. He used this manuscript in his edition of the *Oedipus Coloneus*; his *Oedipus Tyrannus* had been published before his visit to Italy, and the text had been based on inferior manuscripts. Readings from the Laurentian codex were added to the third edition, and his collations of other plays were used after his death in the Oxford edition of 1826. The publication of the scholia from this manuscript, begun by him at the end of his life, was continued after his death by Gaisford.¹

In editing Euripides Elmsley used manuscripts which he had inspected in Paris, Florence and Rome; for his *Medea*, for instance, he collated five codices in the Vatican Library. He did not, like the minor scholars of the eighteenth century, regard variant readings as of value irrespective of their source. He was well aware that manuscripts should be weighed not counted, and that late copies have no independent worth if their original survives.² He was in fact well qualified by his good sense and critical ability to make good use of the material he accumulated.

Thomas Gaisford was born in 1779, educated at a private school at Winchester and at Christ Church, took his degree in 1801, and remained at his college as Student, Professor of Greek (from 1812) and finally Dean (from 1831). Dean Jackson, who encouraged him when he was an undergraduate and appointed him to a studentship, told him: 'You will never be a gentleman, but you may succeed with certainty as a scholar.'³ His prophecy proved correct; Gaisford remained gauche and unamiable, but became a Greek scholar of considerable note.

¹ *Scholia in Sophoclis tragedias vii e codice manuscripto Laurentiano descripta*, 1825-52.

² See his review of Blomfield's *Prometheus* (*Edinburgh Review* (Nov. 1810), xvii, pp. 219 f.).

³ Tuckwell, *Reminiscences of Oxford*, p. 130.

His publications were numerous. He began with school editions of plays of Euripides. In 1806 and 1812 he produced catalogues of the manuscripts of D'Orville and E. D. Clarke which had been acquired by the Bodleian. His edition of Hephaestion on Greek metres (1810) won him a secure reputation as a man of learning, which was enhanced by his *Poetae Minores Graeci* in four volumes (1814-20); the first volume of this work contained Hesiod and the iambic and elegiac writers, the second the Bucolic poets, while the third and fourth were occupied with scholia. In 1820 he published *Lectiones Platonicae* from the Clarke MSS. and in 1836 *Paroemiographi Graeci*, partly from unpublished manuscripts. He edited the *Florilegium* of Stobaeus in four volumes in 1822, and the same author's *Eclogae* (with the Commentary of Hierocles on the Pythagorean *Aurea Carmina*) in two volumes in 1850. The massive two volumes of his Suidas appeared in 1834, and the even more massive single volume of the *Etymologicon Magnum* in 1848. He was also responsible for the 1811 edition of Markland's three plays and for *Variorum* editions of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (1820), Herodotus (1824) and Sophocles (1826). In his later years he edited Eusebius, Theodoret and Choeroboscus.

It is clear from this list that Gaisford was very industrious, and one cannot but respect this massive achievement. But though his editions are learned and careful, there is nothing interesting about his scholarship. In general he was content to collate manuscripts and assemble the best work of other scholars. He rarely proposed emendations of his own and was cautious in admitting those of others into his texts; he selected from the notes of others in preference to making his own interpretations. An author was safe in his hands; but solid industry, however admirable it may be, is not a quality which arouses much enthusiasm in posterity.

Until his death in 1855 Gaisford continued to maintain the dignity of English scholarship. But his learning could not compensate for the losses suffered by English scholarship in 1825. In that year both Dobree and Elmsley died; and in the previous year Blomfield's career as a scholar had been cut short by his appointment to the bishopric of Chester. On the death of Dobree the electors at Cambridge could find no more worthy successor to him in the professorship than

James Scholefield, an earnest evangelical¹ and a Greek scholar of little distinction. Scholefield's editing of Porson's four plays, and of Dobree's *Adversaria*, was a sign of his allegiance to the school of his famous predecessors, while his Aeschylus gives evidence that he was unable to add anything of value himself. Even at the time it was recognised that English scholarship had declined. According to Julius Hare, writing in 1831, 'the mite which England has contributed during the five years from 1825 to 1830 towards the increase of our knowledge concerning classical antiquity is in truth little more than a mite'.² Apart from Fynes Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, scarcely anything had appeared in England in these years except translations from the German.

The *Museum Criticum* came to an end in 1826 after eight numbers; the *Classical Journal* lasted until 1829, but the standard of contributions, never very high, deteriorated, and the later numbers contained more reprints and fewer original articles. The next classical periodical was the *Philological Museum*, started in 1831 by Julius Hare and Connop Thirlwall, with Fynes Clinton as a frequent contributor. But the character of this new periodical was different from that of the *Museum Criticum*, as were the interests of its editors from those of Monk and Blomfield. One has only to glance at the titles of the papers—for example, *On the Names of the Days of the Week* (Hare), *On the Early Ionic Philosophers* (Clinton), *Xenophon, Niebuhr and Delbrueck* (Thirlwall)—to see how within a decade the centre of interest even in the university of Porson had moved from verbal to historical criticism.

1 'It has frequently been remarked that in some ways it [Scholefield's character] resembled that of the prophet Elijah: and in others that of St Paul' (*Memoir of the Rev. James Scholefield, by his widow*, p. 254).

2 *Philological Museum*, 1, p. i.

CHAPTER VIII

Greek History

'I would therefore advise you to study Ancient History, in general, as other people do; that is, not to be ignorant of any of those facts which are universally received, upon the faith of the best historians; and, whether true or false, you have them as other people have them.'

CHESTERFIELD

AS THE previous chapters will have shown, English scholarship of the great age was purely linguistic, and there was little interest in the history of the ancient world or in the historical approach to the ancient authors. This lack of interest was typical of the age, which accepted without criticism a conventional account of the past and regarded history mainly as a source of anecdotes and moral lessons.¹ The ancient world in particular was immune from criticism owing to the veneration which had long surrounded it. Its characters were regarded in much the same light as the heroes of mythology; there was in fact no clear boundary between history and mythology, and the heroes of Plutarch were as real, or as unreal, as the gods and goddesses of Homer, or of Ovid. They served to point a moral, and adorned the prose of the day as the classical deities adorned the poetry.

This is perhaps a somewhat extreme statement of the case, and is less applicable to the later part of the eighteenth century, when ancient history became for the first time the subject of serious study. It is noteworthy, however, that throughout our period it was almost entirely neglected in the schools and universities. Though educationalists might talk vaguely of the political lessons that could be learned and the noble and generous sentiments that could be imbibed from ancient history, they did little to teach it. Nor did the professional scholars pay any attention to the subject; it remained one

¹ This attitude to history can be illustrated by a popular work entitled *The Beauties of History or Pictures of Virtue and Vice drawn from real life, designed for the Instruction and Entertainment of Youth* (6th ed. 1785)—a collection of stories, largely taken from ancient history, illustrative of various moral themes.

for amateurs. Temple Stanyan, author of Greek and Roman histories, adds the suffix Esquire to his name. Gibbon, the historian of Rome, and Mitford, the historian of Greece, were both Hampshire squires and officers in the militia. Goldsmith, if not a gentleman in the strict sense of the word, was certainly an amateur as a scholar; he had no particular qualification as ancient historian, but his bookseller offered him £200 for a history of Greece and he was as willing to turn his hand to this as he had been to write histories of England, of Rome, and of 'the Earth and Animated Nature'.

Before we consider the English histories of Greece it may be appropriate to mention the translations of the ancient historians which were current in our period, for though these writers were not widely read in the original, there seems to have been a fair demand for the English versions, and serious readers probably preferred the ancient authorities to modern compilations based on them. For Herodotus there was the version of Isaac Littlebury, first published in 1709 and often reprinted, even as late as 1824, and that of William Beloe, 1791. Thucydides was translated by William Smith, Dean of Carlisle, in 1753; this translation superseded that of Hobbes and continued in demand into the nineteenth century, though S. T. Bloomfield, who published a new version, with scholarly notes, in 1829, described it as a complete failure.¹ Smith also translated Xenophon's *Hellenica*.² Polybius could be read in Hampton's version (1756-72) and Plutarch's *Lives* in the translation by Dryden and others, first published in 1683, or in that of J. and W. Langhorne (1770).

Perhaps the most popular work on ancient history for the general reader was that of Rollin, translated from the French. It began to appear in 1730, and already in 1739 was said by an English writer to be 'in everybody's hands'.³ The ninth English edition appeared in 1800. Rollin was content to be a compiler, following in the footsteps of the ancient authorities. Voltaire called him 'ce prolix et inutile compilateur'; but his agreeable narrative, interspersed with anecdotes

1 Bloomfield, *History of Thucydides*, Preface, p. xi.

2 He also translated Longinus. His memorial in Chester Cathedral, by Banks, shows a mourning figure in the classic style, and by her side three books, Thucydides, Xenophon and Longinus, crowned by an academic cap.

3 Stanyan, *Grecian History*, II, Preface.

and moral reflections and inspired by a generous enthusiasm, supplied a demand in England as well as in France.¹ Rollin's work was a 'universal history', which treated not only the Greeks but also the Egyptians, Carthaginians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Medes and Persians. Universal histories of this sort enjoyed some popularity in the eighteenth century. Sir Walter Raleigh's *History of the World*, which was in fact a universal ancient history, was still in demand in the early part of the century. There was also a work of composite authorship, published between 1735 and 1744 under the title of *The Universal History*, which covered all peoples ancient and modern; the Greek portions were the work of George Psalmanazar.

The first Englishman to write the history of Greece apart from that of other peoples appears to have been Temple Stanyan. His *Grecian History* was in two volumes, the first covering the period up to the end of the Peloponnesian war and the second carrying the story down to the death of Philip.² His story closely follows the ancient authorities, and includes many anecdotes, and character sketches derived from Plutarch. There is little criticism of sources, only the most elementary reconciling of divergent authorities. When faced with discrepancies, 'All that I could do', he says, 'was to compare them together, to supply the Defects of one out of another, and to extract out of the whole those Particulars which appear'd to me the most rational and probable and most consistent with the common known Character of the Person I was describing.'³ It did not occur to him to question the 'common known character', or to investigate the reliability of the sources from which this character was derived.

In the middle years of the century there was little study of Greek history in England. In Ireland, however, Thomas Leland, fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, produced in 1758 a competent *History of Philip, King of Macedon*.⁴ Though he was to prove too pro-Athenian for Mitford, he could appreciate the virtues of his hero. He ends his book with a summing up of Philip's character in which he faithfully

1 Sainte-Beuve wrote: 'Les Livres de Rollin, c'est proprement l'histoire à lire pendant l'année de la première communion. Maintenant il est difficile d'y revenir' (*Causeries de lundi*, Rollin).

2 Vol. I, 1707; Vol. II, 1739.

3 Vol. II, Preface.

4 He was also author of a standard translation of Demosthenes's speeches which held the field until well into the nineteenth century.

follows Pope's precept 'Search then the Ruling Passion'. Philip's ruling passion he finds to be 'the love of glory and power'. 'In a word', he writes, 'his virtues and vices were directed and proportioned to his great designs of power: his most shining and exalted qualities influenced in a great measure by his ambition: and even to the most exceptionable parts of his conduct was he principally determined by their conveniency and expediency. If he was unjust he was, like Caesar, unjust for the sake of Empire. If he gloried in the successes acquired by his virtues or his intellectual accomplishments, rather than in that which the force of arms could gain, the reason, which he himself assigned, points out his true principle. "In the former case", he said, "the Glory is entirely my own; in the other, my generals and soldiers have their share."' ¹

Another Irishman, John Gast, Archdeacon of Glendalough, ² produced in 1753 a rather absurd history of Greece, in the form of a dialogue between Palaemon and two youths Eudoxus and Cleanthes. Palaemon expounds the story of Greece and the others interject at intervals with such exclamations as 'Happy, happy Athens!', 'Shameful ingratitude!', 'Infamous Villain!' or 'Dire Ambition! What havock dost thou make!' Gast planned to rewrite this book as the first volume of a complete history of Greece. The second volume was to cover the period from the accession of Alexander to the present day, and a third volume was to tell the history of Alexander's successors in Egypt and Asia. The project was never completed, but in 1782, spurred on by hearing of the labours of Gillies and Mitford, and hoping to forestall them, he published his second volume. After his death an old pupil recast the early dialogue to form a first volume of a general history of Greece. Gast perhaps deserves credit for the bold design of his history (though the period from the Roman conquest to the present day is despatched in a few inadequate pages), but he was a poor historian, whose works have been justly neglected in their own day and since. He gapes in admiration at the glory of Greece and drops tears over her fall, which he attributes mainly to 'the fatal prevalence of Atheistical tenets'. ³ He is shocked

1 Ed. 1806, II, p. 432.

2 See Memoir prefixed to his *History of Greece* (Dublin, 1793).

3 *History of Greece* (1793), II, p. 573.

by the rapacity of Rome, but approves of Mummius and commends his destruction of Corinth as due to his 'virtuous and patriotic apprehensions' lest Rome should be corrupted by works of art.¹

From this superficial moralist we turn to two more important men, John Gillies and William Mitford, who independently produced histories of Greece at about the same time.

Gillies² was a graduate of Glasgow University, where he taught for a time as deputy for the Greek professor. Later he travelled as tutor on the continent; he lived for a time in Germany, and wrote a *View of the Reign of Frederick II of Prussia*. In 1793 he was appointed Historiographer Royal for Scotland, in succession to Robertson. In his later years he resided in London and engaged in literary pursuits. His *History of Greece* appeared in 1786, in two volumes. Some years later, in 1807, he published two more volumes under the title *A History of the World from the Reign of Alexander to that of Augustus*. This is in fact a continuation of his *History of Greece*, and does not deal with Rome except in her relations with Greece. It covers the same ground as Gast's second volume, though the treatment is more elaborate and the execution more competent.

Gillies shared the general attitude of his age towards Greek history. It was usual to speak with rather vague admiration of the Greek spirit of liberty and patriotism and to feel that there was some sort of kinship between the free institutions of Britain and those of Greece.³ On the other hand, it was generally agreed that the Greeks could have learnt much from the British constitutional monarchy, which ensured that stability which the Greek democracies lacked. Thus we find Gillies in general appreciative of democratic Athens, but ready to draw the lesson of 'the evils inherent in every form of Republican policy'.⁴ His interests were not, however, exclusively political. He regarded Herodotus as the first of historians in merit

¹ *History of Greece* (1793), II, p. 560.

² 1747-1836.

³ Cf. Sir William Young's *The Spirit of Athens* (1777). Young considered the example of Athens particularly apposite to Britain.

⁴ Vol. I, Dedication. His history is dedicated to George III on the ground that Greek history 'evinces the inestimable benefits, resulting to Liberty itself, from the lawful domination of hereditary Kings'. For similar reasons William Smith dedicated his translation of Thucydides to the Prince of Wales. Stanyan's history was dedicated to Lord Somers, the hero of the Glorious Revolution.

as well as in age,¹ and made a point of treating at length the changes of opinions and manners, and the literary and intellectual history of Greece. In describing the ancient writers and philosophers he makes a considerable advance on the jejune summaries of writers like Temple Stanyan, and he includes a chapter on art, based on Winckelmann and Lessing. His criticisms and his philosophical comments are those of the enlightened academic Scotland of his day. His style is fluent and somewhat pompous. 'The victorious Agamemnon had scarce set foot on his native land when he was cut off by an adulterous spouse and a perfidious assassin.'² The sentence is typical of his style; it also illustrates the then prevailing attitude to mythology, which was in no way distinguished from authentic history.

Gillies's *History* was translated into French and German and reprinted more than once in England, but it was generally regarded as inferior to the more elaborate contemporary work on the same subject of William Mitford.³ Mitford was, as has already been mentioned, a Hampshire gentleman. At Oxford he had neglected his studies and left without a degree. He became a member of Parliament, but seldom spoke; most of his time was spent on his country estate at Exbury, where he devoted himself to study and writing. He was the author of works on language, on the Corn Laws, on the history of Christianity and on architecture, but his most important work was undoubtedly his history of Greece, which he undertook at the suggestion of his neighbour Gibbon. The first volume dates from 1784; it was followed at considerable intervals by four more volumes, the last of which appeared in 1810.⁴

It is a lengthy, clumsily written, rather ill-balanced work, yet there is no doubt that it has a certain interest. Mitford is commonly described as 'the Tory historian of Greece', and the label is just enough, for his political bias is the most striking thing about him, and it is this that gives his work its interest, since it caused him to question many of the conventional judgments and interpretations. In reading him one does not feel any great respect for his head or his heart, yet one is forced to admit that he succeeded in being to some

1 *History of the World*, I, p. iv.

2 *History of Greece*, I, p. 66.

3 1744-1827.

4 Vol. II, 1790; vol. III, 1797; vol. IV, 1808.

extent original and even stimulating, simply by having the courage of his prejudices.

Mitford's main interests were political, and he has little to say on social or intellectual history. His political views were strongly anti-democratic. Democracy to him is capricious and tyrannical. The Athenian people he describes as a 'complex Nero', and its government he compares to the Turkish despotism. His admiration is reserved for the British constitution, and for such approximations to it as he finds in Homeric Phaeacia and fourth-century Macedon. Phaeacia shows a 'mixture of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy not less marked than in the British constitution',¹ and in Macedon he finds 'that popular attachment to the constitution and to the reigning family, the firmest support of political arrangement'.² Several times he draws a parallel between democratic Athens and revolutionary France.

These being his sentiments it is not surprising that he should have reversed many traditional judgments on Greek politics. He defends the tyrants; he excuses Hippias for applying for aid to Artaphernes, and condones the peace of Antalcidas, which former writers, following Plutarch, had condemned as the shame of Greece. He is a partisan of Philip and of the pro-Macedonian party in Athens, while Demosthenes to him is 'an unpleasant companion, a faithless friend, a contemptible soldier and of notorious dishonesty'.³ He even suggests that Demosthenes was in some way responsible for the murder of Philip.⁴

Grote, who was of course highly unsympathetic towards Mitford's political bias, gave him the credit for distinguishing between authorities more accurately than his predecessors and for rejecting some traditional tales that deserved to be rejected.⁵ But he pointed out serious inadequacies in his research,⁶ his inaccuracies and misrepresentations, and his proneness to give conjectures as facts. He showed too the superficiality of his historical criticism. Mitford was ready

1 (2nd ed.) vol. I, p. 181. 2 IV, p. 194. 3 IV, p. 388. 4 IV, p. 620.

5 *Westminster Review* (Apr. 1826), v, pp. 269 f. There is also a review of Mitford's history by Macaulay, *Works* (ed. 1871), VII, p. 683.

6 For example, for his account of the Athenian constitution Mitford relied on the century-old handbook of Potter.

to question the authority of non-contemporary writers, but was too apt to reject them in a wholesale way without inquiring into their sources or attempting to distinguish the true from the false. He was, moreover, inclined to let his political bias influence his criticism and to depreciate late authorities whom he considered to be prejudiced partisans of democracy.

A reviewer of Mitford's second volume regretfully remarked, 'We do not perceive that it breathes that ardent spirit of liberty which might have been expected in a history of Greece', and censured him for his lack of sympathy with 'the present arduous struggle for freedom in France'.¹ However, by the time that the next volume appeared the views of the public were nearer to those of Mitford and less in sympathy with the French republic; the same *Review* recanted and praised Mitford for his political wisdom.² His history proved acceptable during the period of anti-revolutionary feeling; in spite of its unattractive style it was popular,³ and remained the standard work on the subject until it was superseded by the histories of Thirlwall and Grote.

The Greek histories of these two distinguished writers fall outside our period, but as early as 1826 Grote had expressed his dissatisfaction with Mitford and given some of his views on Greek history in an article in the *Westminster Review*.⁴ The article is nominally a review of Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, but actually in the main a severe criticism of Mitford's shortcomings and a corrective of his bias. Grote admits the faults of the Greek democracies, but maintains that in spite of their faults they were superior to any other form of government in antiquity. There might be follies and crimes in the democratic states but the oligarchies were potentially worse. Moreover, it was the democratic spirit that made possible the great achievements of Greece.

¹ *Monthly Review*, Dec. 1790, p. 387.

² *Ibid.* Oct. 1797.

³ 'His great pleasure', wrote Byron, 'consists in praising tyrants, abusing Plutarch, spelling oddly and writing quaintly; and what is strange after all, *his* is the best modern history of Greece in any language, and he is perhaps the best of all modern historians whatsoever. Having named his sins, it is but fair to state his virtues—learning, labour, research, wrath and partiality. I call the latter virtues in a writer, because they make him write in earnest.' Note on *Don Juan*, Canto XII, Stanza xix.

⁴ Apr. 1826, v, p. 269.

Why, asks Grote, did Greece produce so much individual talent? He finds the explanation in the life of the city state with its free discussion and its public activity. 'It is to democracy alone (and to that sort of open aristocracy which is, practically, very similar to it) that we owe that unparalleled brilliancy and diversity of individual talent which constitutes the charm and glory of Grecian history.'¹ This was the point of view from which Grote later wrote his famous history, which interpreted the history of Greece to the Victorian age, as Macaulay interpreted English history.

'No circumstance of Greek history', says Mitford, 'has been more labored by learned men and yet none remains more uncertain than its chronology.'² He goes on to give a list of these learned men—'Scaliger, Selden, Lydiatt, Marsham, Prideaux, Petarius, Calvisius, Pezron, Ussher, Newton, Jackson and lastly the indefatigable Freret.'³ The majority of these names belong to the seventeenth century, that age of heavy and universal learning, though Jackson's *Chronological Antiquities*⁴ appeared in 1752, and after Mitford wrote William Hales,⁵ a scholar of the old school, published his *New Analysis of Chronology* (three volumes, 1809–12). The main interest of these chronologists was in Biblical history; on Greek history the most interesting suggestions seem to have been those of Sir Isaac Newton, whose *Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended* had occupied his last years and was published in 1728. He questioned the authority of Eratosthenes and other Greek chronologists and put the early events of Greek history considerably later than their traditional dates. The ancient chronologists had put the Return of the Heraclidae 622 years before the battle of Thermopylae, calculating by the lists of the kings of Sparta. Newton considered that they had reckoned the reigns as considerably too long. His own calculation put the return about 340 years before Thermopylae. The capture of Troy and the Argonautic expedition were consequently brought down to 904 and

1 *Westminster Review*, Apr. 1826, v, p. 280.

2 *History of Greece*, I, p. 155.

3 He might also have mentioned the name of Henry Dodwell, the learned non-juror, whose labours Fynes Clinton considered highly valuable. *Fasti Hellenici*, 2nd ed. p. xxiii.

4 John Jackson. 'This erudite and elaborate but desultory work' (Hales, *New Analysis of Chronology*, I, p. 60).

5 1741–1831.

936 B.C. He supported his dates by astronomical calculations involving the precession of the equinoxes. This new chronology was not generally accepted. Among its opponents were Arthur Bedford,¹ Atwell and Robinson,² Samuel Squire,³ George Costard,⁴ and Musgrave.⁵ Mitford, however, in his history followed Newton rather than the accepted chronology.

The older race of chronologists, who surveyed sacred and profane history, divided it into epochas and aeras, and confidently fixed the date of the Creation and the Flood, died out, and much of their work became irrelevant with the increase of scepticism concerning the early records of human history. A more exacting and critical scholarship was applied to the subject of ancient chronology by Henry Fynes Clinton,⁶ whose *Fasti Hellenici* was published in three parts between 1824 and 1830. Clinton was a product of Westminster and Christ Church, a man of independent means and for many years a silent member of Parliament. His literary journal, published after his death, shows a great zeal for reading and a singular lack of interest in the matter of the authors he read. It consists mainly of elaborate calculations of the number of pages occupied by the ancient writers, the amount already read and the time required for completing his reading. His interest in Greek history was not that of Mitford or Grote; he was not concerned to interpret or draw morals, but only to discover *wie es eigentlich gewesen ist*, or rather *wann*. For a chronologer a dry and statistical mind is no disadvantage. The value of his work, with its full collection of evidence clearly arranged, has been generally recognised, and it is still consulted by historians.⁷

1 *Animadversions on Sir Isaac Newton's Chronology*, 1729.

2 Introduction to Hesiod, 1737.

3 *Two Essays*, 1741.

4 *Astronomical and Philological Conjectures*, 1768.

5 *Dissertation on Newton's Chronology*, 1782.

6 1781-1852.

7 A valuable feature of Clinton's work was the 'literary chronology', in which he assembled and assessed the evidence for the dating of the ancient authors. Something of the sort had been projected by Gray; see *Correspondence of Thomas Gray* (ed. Toynbee and Whibley), p. 259 (vol. 1).

CHAPTER IX

Greek Philosophy

'But Plato the philosopher, but the divine Plato, was not to be comprehended within the field of vision, or be commanded by the fixed immovable telescope of Mr Locke's human understanding.'

COLERIDGE

GREEK PHILOSOPHY had no place in the educational system of the eighteenth century, and neither the schools nor the universities gave any encouragement to its study. The Renaissance view, as expressed, for instance, by Elyot in his *Governour*, which made the study of Plato, Aristotle and Xenophon the summit of humanist learning, had not survived. The classical education was now exclusively linguistic and literary. The undergraduate at Oxford or Cambridge read only a few isolated dialogues of Plato and learnt nothing of his philosophic theories. Gray, we are told, 'lost all patience when he talked of the neglect of his favourite author at the Universities'.¹ Aristotelian logic might be taught, but from handbooks that dispensed with the necessity of consulting Aristotle himself.

Thus among the educated public there was a very inadequate knowledge of Greek philosophy, and even Plato, the most readable of philosophers, was little known either in the original Greek or in translation. 'Plato is unfashionable', according to a writer of 1762; 'the number of Platonic readers is now very inconsiderable.'² An age of common sense rejected a philosopher associated with high-flown mysticism, with 'fabling and smooth conceits'. The atmosphere of neo-Platonism which still surrounded his works³ discouraged any new and independent approach, while the confused and unintelligible

¹ *Correspondence of Thomas Gray* (ed. Toynbee and Whibley), p. 1295 (vol. III).

² *Monthly Review*, March 1762, p. 169. The situation seems to have been very similar on the Continent. 'Qui eum [sc. Platonem] legant pauci sunt; qui intelligent, paucissimi; qui vero vel ex versionibus vel ex ieiuno historiae philosophiae compendio, de eo iudicent et cum supercilio pronuncient plurimi sunt' (Wytttenbach, *Bibliotheca Critica*, I, p. 28).

³ In Stanley's *History of Greek Philosophy* the account of Plato's philosophy is taken from Alcinous; that of Aristotle is direct from his works.

impression they conveyed was increased by the fact that there was at that time not even the approximate knowledge we now have of the order in which they were written.

There was no full translation of Plato in English until that of Sydenham and Taylor, published in 1804. The Greekless reader had to be content with the selections translated from Dacier's French version, first published in England in 1701; it was from this source that Shelley derived his first knowledge of Plato.¹ Attempts to produce a complete translation of the dialogues met with little encouragement and had to be abandoned. In Scotland Foulis projected such a translation, but nothing was published but the version of the *Republic* by H. Spens, D.D., Minister of Wemyss, familiar to-day from its republication in the Everyman series.² In England Floyer Sydenham met with neglect and discouragement and died penniless and insane; lack of subscribers held up his translation and he completed only a small part of it.³

There were some who regarded Plato not merely with indifference but with active dislike. There is a curious book by one Charles Crawford, fellow-commoner of Queens' College, Cambridge, called *A Dissertation on the Phaedo* (1733), which is inspired by a strong distaste for Plato. The book consists mainly of summary and quotation from the dialogue, interspersed with expressions of dissent, and denies Plato elegance of composition as well as sound reasoning.⁴

1 Hogg, *Life of Shelley*, I, p. 103.

2 Biography of Spens (1713-87) in *Intro. to Everyman ed.*

3 For Sydenham's career, see *D.N.B.* and Maltby, *Porsenniana*, p. 328 n. He had been a fellow of Wadham and holder of the valuable living of Esher. This he gave up in order, so it is said, to marry a lady whose father objected to a clerical son-in-law. In fact he never married her, but after an unsuccessful attempt to practise as a barrister, joined the navy and served as a common sailor. In later life he lived a struggling existence in London, devoting himself to the study of Plato. He issued proposals for his translation, with an introductory essay, in 1759, and between that year and 1780 published nine dialogues. In his last years he was partially insane; he was about to be imprisoned for debt in 1787 when he was found dead, having, so it was believed, committed suicide.

4 Like certain Americans more recently, Crawford had discovered and was shocked by Plato's homosexuality. He expresses a hope that even if he does not succeed in arousing contempt for Plato's works he will make Plato the man detested (*A Dissertation on the Phaedo*, p. xxi).

Its author is an example of a type not confined to the eighteenth century, the rebel who rebels against what is already unfashionable and condemns what he has scarcely attempted to understand.

While Plato was regarded with little sympathy, a general respect and admiration surrounded the figure of Socrates. John Gilbert Cooper, a minor poet and literary man, published in 1749 a *Life of Socrates*, written in a tone of fervent admiration, in which he describes Socrates as a 'martyr for Truth Religion and Virtue'.¹ Thomson, the poet of the seasons, writes:

Tutor of Athens! he in every street
Dealt priceless treasure, goodness his delight,
Wisdom his wealth, and glory his reward . . . etc.²

Xenophon provided the main element in the popular picture of Socrates; the honest and straightforward moralist of the *Memorabilia* was more familiar and more congenial to the age than the ironic and somewhat bewildering figure depicted in Plato's dialogues.

Aristotle was no less unfashionable than Plato. His name suggested the barren disputes of the schoolmen, which were happily remote from an age of taste and enlightenment. Only the *Poetics* and the *Rhetoric* were at all widely read. Even the *Ethics* were little known; an edition by William Wilkinson was published at Oxford in 1716, but the second edition did not appear until 1803, nor was there any English translation before Gillies's of 1797.³

Of the remarkable speculations of the pre-Socratics there was no appreciation. Monboddo, who professes to be a great admirer of ancient philosophy, passes over the Ionian and Eleatic schools as containing 'nothing deserving the name of philosophy'.⁴ It was not until many scholars had laboured on their scanty fragments that a

¹ *Life of Socrates*, p. 173. Socrates's 'Demon' aroused a certain interest. It is discussed in Cooper's book, and in *An Essay on the Demon of Socrates* by R. Nares, 1782.

² *Liberty*, Bk. II (1735).

³ Unless one counts a translation by John Wilkinson (1547) of an Italian compendium by Brunetto Latini and a translation of the first book only by Edward Pargiter (1745).

⁴ *Antient Metaphysics*, III, p. xix. On the other hand Pythagoras is 'undoubtedly the greatest philosopher that ever was in Europe'.

just estimate could be formed of the achievements of these pioneers of European thought. Of Greek philosophy after Aristotle there was more knowledge. The educated man was familiar from his reading of Cicero with the Stoic and Epicurean systems. He was well acquainted too with the moral teaching of later antiquity. While Sydenham starved and his Plato remained unsold, Elizabeth Carter made £1000 out of her translation of Epictetus.

When we turn to the professed philosophers, we find, as we should expect, a general indifference to the Greeks. The age of the Cambridge Platonists was past, and Locke with his freedom from traditionalism set the tone for eighteenth-century philosophy. As Muirhead says, in the century that followed that of the Cambridge Platonists, 'the seed thus replanted and copiously watered failed to show above the ground except in the pale form of the later speculations of Bishop Berkeley'.¹ Berkeley's philosophy as expounded in his earlier works was not influenced by Plato or by any other ancient philosopher. The 'New Principle' which was his contribution to philosophic thought, the principle of 'Esse est percipi', was in truth new, and though it might be expounded in dialogues recalling those of Plato, was not suggested by Plato and was indeed hardly reconcilable with Platonism. In later life he fell to some extent under the spell of the ancients, and in his *Siris, or A Chain of Philosophical Reflections* (1744) he passed from the virtues of Tar Water to the nature of the Cosmos, supporting his reflections by quotations from Plato and the neo-Platonists. This later development was, however, of little importance either as advancing the knowledge of Plato (for Berkeley's study of the ancient philosophers, though sympathetic, was unsystematic) or as influencing the thought of the period. The eighteenth century remained uninterested in Greek philosophy, and only a few individuals stood out against the prevailing current. Two writers, one of whom at least is not wholly forgotten, made a vain attempt to revive the ancient philosophy. These were James Harris in England and Lord Monboddo in Scotland. Each looked to the other's country for support; Harris had hopes of finding readers in

¹ Muirhead, *The Platonic Tradition in Anglo-Saxon Philosophy*, p. 13. Muirhead also mentions John Norris (1657-1711) and Arthur Collier (1680-1732) as carrying on the Platonic tradition into the eighteenth century.

Scotland, whereas Monboddo believed that the ancient philosophy he championed would be more sympathetically received in a country where men learned Greek and were not corrupted by 'the wretched philosophy of David Hume'.¹ Neither advocate, however, was able or persuasive enough to turn men back from modern heresies to the wisdom of the ancients.

James Harris, of Salisbury, was a gentleman of leisure and good family, the nephew of Shaftesbury, the philosopher, and the father of the first Earl of Malmesbury. He was the author of *Hermes*, a work on the philosophy of grammar which was highly esteemed, and was translated into French and German.² In his *Philosophical Arrangements* (1775) he gave a dry and academic exposition of what he considered to be Aristotelian doctrine.

If Harris was too dull to have much influence, Monboddo was too eccentric. It was easy to laugh at his rustic dress and his air baths, his theories about the ouran-outang and his belief in the virtues of savages. His ideas were hardly taken seriously, though he was a respected figure in Edinburgh and London, and an agreeable host at Monboddo, where Dr Johnson visited him in 1773 and, to Boswell's relief, did not disagree too violently with him.

The ancient Greeks have had many admirers, but few so devoted and uncompromising as Lord Monboddo. In his view they were superior to the moderns not only in philosophy and science, but also in size, strength and longevity. His own age was sadly decadent, and there was only one hope for mankind, 'the study of ancient men and manners by those who govern us'.³ His views on philosophy and human history were expounded in two works, *The Origin of Language* and *Antient Metaphysics*, both in six volumes and both diffuse and repetitive. In philosophy his masters were Plato, Aristotle and the neo-Platonists.⁴ All modern philosophers from Descartes,

1 Knight, *Lord Monboddo and his Contemporaries*, pp. 91, 118.

2 'The most beautiful example of analysis produced since the days of Aristotle' (South, Bishop of London). "'Hermes" Harris', said Dr Johnson, 'is a prig and a bad prig.'

3 Knight, *op. cit.* p. 215.

4 He regarded Plato as more imperfect without Aristotle than Aristotle was without Plato. Aristotle had 'cleared the principles of philosophy from that obscurity which the enthusiasm and mystic genius of Plato had thrown upon them'. But Plato was the nobler of the two. Knight, *op. cit.* pp. 49, 138.

with a few exceptions such as Cudworth and Harris, were condemned in his eyes by their neglect of the ancients. He stood forth as a champion of 'the ancient theism', of the belief that mind operates continuously in matter, and from this standpoint attacked the prevailing theories of Locke and Hume. He was not a negligible philosopher, but his apparent belief that the moderns were wrong because they were moderns, together with his credulity, his intellectual vagaries and his diffuseness, lost him any disciples his abilities might have won him.

Aristotle found a champion, more discriminating than Monboddo, in John Gillies, the historian of Greece, who translated the *Ethics* and *Politics* in 1797 and the *Rhetoric* in 1823, prefixing to the former an analysis of Aristotle's speculative writings, and to the latter an answer to the philosopher's modern critics. He criticises Harris and Monboddo for viewing the works of Aristotle 'through the antic trappings in which the visionary commentaries of the Alexandrian school had disguised them'.¹ His own intention was to present Aristotle as he was; but he does not conceal his admiration, and in old age he appears as a high and dry Aristotelian, convinced that his master supplies 'the absolute and unalterable principles of good taste, the foundations of all correct moral reasoning, and humanly speaking the maxims of all sound practical reasoning',² and that all deviations from his philosophy are deviations into error.³

Most fanatical of all champions of ancient philosophy was Thomas Taylor, commonly known as 'the Platonist' (1758-1835). He was almost entirely self-taught; he left school at the age of twelve, and while working as a clerk in a bank spent his nights in mastering Plato and Aristotle. He had been intended for the nonconformist ministry, but at an early age rejected Christianity and determined to devote himself to the study of Greek philosophy and the practice of its precepts. He conceived the design of translating the extant remains of the Greek philosophers, and succeeded not only in completing the translation of Plato begun by Sydenham but in adding the works of Aristotle and a large part of the neo-Platonist corpus. He was fortunate in finding friends willing to help him. He was able to leave his bank and find more congenial employment as Assistant Secretary

1 Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, p. 26.

2 *Idem*, p. 7.

3 *Idem*, p. 131.

to the Society of Arts, and in 1806 he resigned and gave himself up entirely to translation.¹

Taylor won a certain notoriety as 'The English Pagan' and 'England's Gentile Priest'. He was believed to have revived pagan worship as well as pagan philosophy, and his rooms were said to be the scene of sacrifices and libations. It is probable, however, that legend made Taylor's life more picturesque than it really was.² There was nothing romantic or aesthetic about his paganism; he seems to have been a narrow unimaginative *dévo*t whose religion was not that of his own age but that of the age of Iamblichus and Porphyry. His life was simple and blameless, and his personality rather dull.

His translations were extremely numerous. His Plato, incorporating the work of Sydenham, appeared in 1804, and his Aristotle, in ten volumes, between 1806 and 1812. He also translated various works of Proclus, Plotinus, Iamblichus, Porphyry and the Emperor Julian; fragments of the Pythagoreans, the Orphic hymns, Sallustius on the Gods, the dissertations of Maximus Tyrius, and Apuleius, whom Taylor admired as 'the greatest of ancient Latin Platonists'.³ The only wholly unphilosophical author he translated was Pausanias; this was done to order for a bookseller and, so it is said, was the only work by which Taylor made any money. Apart from translations he published a *Dissertation on the Eleusinian and Bacchic Mysteries* (1790), *Miscellanies in Prose and Verse* (1805) and a collection of contributions to periodicals (1806).

Taylor was ill qualified for the immense task he set himself. He was by no means strong as a Greek scholar. In Porson's words, he had plunged to the very bottom of pagan philosophy without staying to learn the inflexions of the Greek words. He was unable to make any use of the emendations that Porson sent him on learning of his proposed translation of Plato. Reviewers found no difficulty in pointing to numerous mistakes, some of which were due to his habit

1 His translation of Plato was financed by the Duke of Norfolk, and his Aristotle by a wealthy merchant called William Meredith.

2 According to Edward Peacock the stories about Taylor are derived from the caricature of him in Isaac D'Israeli's novel *Vaurien* (*Antiquary*, xviii, July 1888).

3 Preface to translation of Apuleius.

of translating from Latin versions rather than from the Greek.¹ Nor were his faults of scholarship compensated by any graces of style. His versions were literal without being accurate. His style was stiff and uncouth, abounding in clumsy Latinisms. Where the Greek was at all obscure Taylor's version was quite unintelligible.²

As an interpreter of ancient philosophy he showed a complete lack of historical and critical sense. It might have been said of him, as Coleridge said of the Cambridge Platonists, that he was a Plotinist rather than a Platonist. He was convinced that ancient philosophy and religion formed a single system, of which Orpheus, Pythagoras and Plato were the prophets and Proclus, Plotinus and Porphyry the interpreters. It was a revelation final and unalterable, a rock, as he put it, against which the sea beat in vain. The hierophant of revived paganism made no concessions to the modern world, and his arrogance and credulity were more likely to discredit than to commend his Platonism.

'Taylor's book', wrote Horace Walpole, referring to the translation of Proclus's Commentaries, 'was shown to me this summer. . . . I find that the world's future religion is to be founded on a blundered translation of an almost unintelligible commentator on Plato. . . . Taylor will have no success.'³ He had none, or very little. Enthusiasm without scholarship or literary gifts was not enough; his paganism offended Christians, and his lack of education offended scholars. Yet he had a following in America, among a people who were willing to accept a teacher without enquiring too closely into his credentials.⁴ In England, though he has always been frowned on by academic opinion, there seems to have been a constant if small demand for his books, and some of them have even been reprinted in the present century.⁵

1 *British Critic* (July 1806), xxviii, p. 59; *Edinburgh Review* (Apr. 1809), xiv, p. 187.

2 Even Coleridge found his Proclus unintelligible (Hanson, *Life of S. T. Coleridge*, p. 21).

3 Letters, Nov. 26, 1789.

4 He is also said to have had a following in France. 'His writings had no small share in producing that tawdry classical enthusiasm which was so fashionable during the early years of the Revolution' (*Fraser's Magazine* (Nov. 1875), p. 647).

5 Iamblichus, *Life of Pythagoras* and *On the Mysteries of Eleusis*, 1926. Plotinus, *On the Beautiful*, 1917, 1932. The original editions fetch high prices on account of their scarcity and good printing.

The imaginative poetical side of Plato, and his literary gifts, were on the whole as little appreciated as his philosophy. There were, however, a few exceptions.¹ Gray, whose learning extended in many directions beyond the limits set by contemporary fashion, was a reader of Plato, and read him mainly for reasons other than purely philosophical. His notes on Plato show the care with which he had read the dialogues, and his independent approach. He did not read them as was generally done by the few who did read Plato, through neo-Platonic eyes, or with the idea of finding a system. He admired, we are told, not Plato's mystic doctrines nor his sophistry but his 'excellent sense, sublime morality, elegant style and the perfect dramatic propriety of his dialogues'.² A quotation from his notes on the *Phaedo* will show the character of his approach: 'The historical part of it is admirable, and though written and disposed with all the art and management of the best tragic writer (for the slightest circumstance in it wants not its force and meaning), it exhibits nothing to the eye but the noble simplicity of nature. . . . The innocence, the humanity, the cheerfulness and the unaffected intrepidity of Socrates will draw some tears from him [the reader]. . . as for the loss of a father; and will, at the same time, better than any arguments, show him a soul, which, if it were not so, at least deserved to be immortal. The reasoning part is far inferior, sometimes weak, sometimes false, too obscure, too abstracted, to convince us of anything; yet with a mixture of good sense and with many fine observations.'³

Among the literary critics an occasional voice was raised in praise of Plato's style or of his imaginative powers. James Geddes, a Scotsman who practised at the Edinburgh bar and died at an early age, published in 1748 *An Essay on the Composition and Manner of Writing of the Ancients, particularly Plato*, in which he examines Plato's style at length, and claims that in invention he is second only to Homer.

¹ Fielding was well acquainted with Plato and took a volume of his works with him on his last voyage.

² *Correspondence of Thomas Gray* (ed. Toynbee and Whibley), p. 1295 (vol. III). 'The poet Plato,' wrote Coleridge, 'the orator Plato, Plato the exquisite dramatist of conversation, the seer and the painter of character, Plato the high bred, highly educated, aristocratic republican, the man and the gentleman of quality stands full before us from behind the curtain as Gray has drawn it back' (Raysor, *Coleridge's Miscellaneous Criticism*, p. 308).

³ Gray, *Works*, ed. Gosse (1884), IV, p. III.

Another Scotsman, W. Duff, included an appreciation of Plato in his *Essay on Original Genius* (1767). 'He was indeed', he writes, 'animated with all the ardor and enthusiasm of Imagination which distinguishes the Poet.'¹ So too Hurd, in his *Discourse on Poetic Imitation*, remarks that Plato's 'fervid fancy, though it sometimes obscures his reasoning, yet never fails to clear and brighten his imagery'.²

In spite of such occasional utterances Platonism was as alien to the literary as it was to the philosophical tradition of the eighteenth century. With the coming of the nineteenth century there was not any noticeable increase in the number of readers of Plato, nor in the influence exercised by him on English thought. There was, however, a greater sympathy on the part of the poets. Coleridge frequently expressed admiration for Plato,³ and could appreciate his poetic qualities, as well as his thought.⁴ Those echoes of Platonism that can be heard in Wordsworth, for instance in his *Intimations of Immortality*, are probably due to natural affinity rather than to the influence of reading. Shelley, however, is known to have been a constant reader of Plato, to whom he was drawn not only by admiration for his style but also by a strong sympathy with his ideas.⁵

Of Plato's language he wrote with warm admiration. 'Plato exhibits the rare union of close and subtle logic with the Pythian enthusiasm of poetry, melted by the splendour and harmony of his periods into one irresistible stream of musical impressions, which hurry the persuasion onward as in a breathless career. His language is that of an immortal spirit rather than a man.'⁶ Of his theories he speaks with more restrained admiration: 'His views into the nature of mind and existence are often obscure, only because they are profound; and though his theories respecting the government of the world, and the elementary laws of moral action, are not always

1 P. 104. Duff combines his interest in 'original genius' with a belief in the Hebraic and scriptural origin of many of Plato's ideas.

2 Hurd, *Works* (1811), II, p. 112.

3 See (e.g.) *Table Talk*, Apr. 30, 1830. 'I have read most of the works of Plato several times with profound attention... He was a consummate genius.'

4 'The writings of Plato... furnish undeniable proofs that poetry of the highest kind may exist without metre' (*Biographia Literaria*), ch. XIV.

5 See Winstanley, *Platonism in Shelley. Essays and Studies by members of the English Association*, IV (1913).

6 *On the Symposium*, a fragment.

correct, yet there is scarcely any of his treatises which do not, however stained by puerile sophisms, contain the most remarkable intuitions into all that can be the subject of the human mind.’¹

Shelley’s own thought was noticeably influenced by these intuitions. His reading of Plato helped to lead him away from the Godwinian materialism of his early youth to an idealism in which there were many Platonic elements. He translated parts of Plato, the *Symposium*, the *Menexenus*, and portions of the *Republic*. He described the *Symposium* as ‘the most beautiful and perfect among all the works of Plato’, and he was deeply impressed by its theories of love and beauty. His *Epipsychidion* is full of ideas which derive, whether mediately or immediately, from Plato.

The idealisation of love, the quest for beauty itself behind its various manifestations, the contrast between the transient world of phenomena and the unchanging idea, the picture of this life as an imperfect and shadowy existence, or even as a tomb in which the immortal soul is buried, the theory of pre-existence and reincarnation—all these Platonic ideas are found scattered about in Shelley’s poetry. The most sustained expression of Platonism is in the latter part of *Adonais*:

Peace, peace! he is not dead, he doth not sleep—
He hath awakened from the dream of life—
’Tis we, who, lost in stormy visions, keep
With phantoms an unprofitable strife,
And in mad trance, strike with our spirit’s knife
Invulnerable nothings—*We* decay
Like corpses in a charnel....

The One remains, the many change and pass:
Heaven’s light for ever shines, Earth’s shadows fly;
Life, like a dome of many-coloured glass,
Stains the white radiance of Eternity,
Until Death tramples it to fragments.

The inspiration of these stanzas is clear. It is not the Christian hope of the Resurrection with which the poet consoles himself for the death of *Adonais*, but the Platonic idea that death is a release from the world of phenomena, a change from unrealities to reality, from the impermanent to the permanent.

1. *On the Symposium, a fragment.*

CHAPTER X

Greek Poetry. Homer

Read Homer once, and you can read no more,
For all books else appear so mean, so poor,
Verse will seem prose, but still persist to read,
And Homer will be all the books you need.

DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM

IN THE seventeenth century there had flourished, mainly in France, but also to a lesser extent in England, a rather futile controversy known as the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns. The champions of the ancients maintained that in antiquity were to be found not only the final standards of taste but also all wisdom and science, and that all that the modern world could do was to admire and imitate the ancient writers and to sit at the feet of the ancient teachers. Their opponents, while rightly and reasonably holding that in some respects the modern world had improved and could improve on the ancient, at the same time took the opportunity to depreciate the ancient writers in a foolish and often ignorant manner. The controversy did little to advance either knowledge or criticism. It did, however, have the effect of clearing the air and of paving the way for a more reasonable attitude. In the eighteenth century it was still the general view that the ancients were supreme in poetry and oratory, but it was allowed that in philosophy, science and learning the moderns might have the advantage.¹ Thus it was possible to admire Homer as a poet without having to maintain that he knew more of astronomy than Newton or of philosophy than Locke; and while, as we have seen in the previous chapter, no great respect was paid to the Greeks as thinkers, their supremacy in poetry was scarcely questioned.

Greek poetry meant above all Homer, the one Greek poet whom everyone read, whether in the original or in translation. The *Iliad* was the universal text-book for schoolboys; it was the companion of statesmen and to critics the acknowledged model of an epic. Homer

1 See Blair, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, Lecture XXXV.

was 'the prince of poets', the author of the first and best epic poem. The reputation of the *Iliad* has probably never stood higher than in the eighteenth century. The heroic epic was regarded as the highest form of literature, and the ancient critics who had formed their theories and drawn their illustrations from Homer were in high repute. Aristotle, Longinus, Horace, 'the happy few Athens and Rome in better ages knew' all pointed to the first of poets.

Be Homer's works your study and delight,
Read them by day and meditate by night.
Thence form your judgment, thence your maxims bring,
And trace the Muses upward to their spring.

Nor was Homer's reputation yet affected by the 'Homeric question'. Homer was still a poet, and not a number of bards or a fortuitous concourse of lays.

For those who could not read Homer in the original there was Pope's translation, which became a part of English literature as no other translation from the classics has done. His *Iliad* was published between 1715 and 1720, and the *Odyssey*, for which he had the assistance of Broome and Fenton, followed in the years 1725-6. The translation was welcomed enthusiastically; its success was so great that by means of it Pope became the first man of letters to live in comfortable independence on the earnings of his pen. It continued to find favour throughout the century, and well into the nineteenth century, even after its accuracy had been impugned by scholars and its style by literary critics.

'It is a pretty poem, Mr Pope,' said Bentley, 'but you must not call it Homer.' Pope's knowledge of Greek was, it is known, limited, and he was content to reproduce the general sense of his author with the aid of previous translations. But it was not only through ignorance of Greek that he misrepresented Homer. It was mainly because of his confident belief in the superior elegance of his own age and his own style, and his indifference to the fact that Homer lived and worked under completely different conditions from those of the early eighteenth century. He saw no impropriety in using for the *Iliad* the same style that he had used for translating Ovid and Statius.

It is probable that Pope himself realised to some extent that he

was misrepresenting Homer, but considered himself justified in improving on him and in adding the elegance that the times demanded. Dr Johnson was certainly aware that Pope's version was not entirely Homeric, and that it could be criticised as exhibiting 'no resemblance of the original and characteristick manner of the Father of Poetry, as it wants his awful simplicity, his artless grandeur, his unaffected majesty'.¹ But he defends the translator's embellishments. Virgil, he tells us, had found that 'mere nature' would not be endured in his age, and so had embellished what he had borrowed from Homer. Since Virgil's time there had been an increase in elegance, and 'what was expedient to Virgil was necessary to Pope'. This was the theory by which Pope's Homer was justified. Though at the time when Johnson wrote the prejudice against 'mere nature' had greatly diminished, there was still something of the spirit of the French neo-classicist school which had found Homer's language coarse and his heroes barbarous and unpolished.

However limited his knowledge of Greek was, and however inappropriate the stylistic elegances which he imposed on the original, Pope shows in the preface and the notes to his Homer that he had a truer appreciation of his author than might have been expected. He is full of admiration, and many of his comments are just and valuable. He praises Homer's 'fire and rapture', and his supreme power of 'invention'. 'Exact description, just thought, correct elocution, polished numbers, may have been found in a thousand; but this poetical fire, this *Vivida vis animi* in a very few.'² His comparison of Homer with Virgil shows that he was not unduly prejudiced in favour of Augustan polish. Homer, he maintains, excels in invention, Virgil in judgment. 'Homer was the greater genius, Virgil the better artist. In one we most admire the man, in the other the work. Homer hurries and transports us with a commanding impetuosity; Virgil leads on with an attractive majesty. Homer scatters with a generous profusion; Virgil bestows with a careful magnificence.'³ Again, he compares Homer's work to a 'wild

1 Johnson, *Life of Pope* (*Lives of Poets*, ed. Hill, III, p. 238).

2 This and the following quotations are taken from the preface to the *Iliad*.

3 There is a similar comparison of Homer and Virgil in Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric*, XLIII fin.

paradise, where, if we cannot see all the beauties so distinctly as in an ordered garden, it is only because the number of them is infinitely greater'.

In his notes to his translation Pope's main object is to point out the beauties of his author. Some of his observations are derived from ancient authorities¹ or from modern critics such as Mme Dacier, but not a few are his own. As a commentator Pope is sensible and appreciative, and successfully defends his author against his French detractors. He has some good remarks to make on Homer's characters, and in his treatment of this subject shows more intelligence than those of his predecessors who, regarding Homer primarily as a moral teacher, had represented his heroes as models of virtue, or, seeing that they were not perfect, had blamed Homer for their imperfections. Pope saw that a poem could be moral even if its characters were not wholly perfect. His remarks on the character of Achilles deserve quotation:

'We should know that the Poet has rather study'd Nature than Perfection in the laying down his Characters. He resolv'd to sing the Consequences of Anger; he consider'd what Virtues and Vices would conduce most to bring his Moral out of the Fable; and artfully dispos'd them in his chief Persons after the manner in which we generally find them; making the Fault which most peculiarly attends any good Quality to reside with it. . . . Thus we must take his *Achilles*, not as a meer heroick dispassion'd Character, but as one compounded of Courage and Anger; one who finds himself almost invincible, and assumes an uncontroul'd Carriage upon the Self-consciousness of his Worth; whose high Strain of Honour will not suffer him to betray his Friends or fight against them, even when he thinks they have affronted him; but whose inexorable Resentment will not let him hearken to any Terms of Accommodation. These are the Lights and Shades of his Character, which *Homer* has heighten'd and darken'd in Extreame; because on the one side Valour is the darling Quality of Epic Poetry, and on the other, Anger the particular Subject of his Poem. When Characters thus mix'd are well conducted, tho' they be

¹ The excerpts from Eustathius were supplied by Broome and others.

not morally beautiful quite through, they conduce more to the end, and are still poetically perfect.'¹

Prefixed to the second volume of the *Iliad* (first edition) is an *Essay on Homer's Battles* which contains some interesting observations on the technique of the *Iliad*. Pope puts the question: How does Homer avoid monotony in his descriptions of battles? The answer lies partly in the variety in the characters of the heroes killed, the postures in which they die and their wounds; partly also in the skill with which Homer relieves and diverts the mind of the reader from the contemplation of successive combats and deaths by his similes,² and by the details about the dying heroes, which transport the reader to their homes and families and suggest emotions of pity and compassion. The most effective device for preserving interest in the battles is Homer's 'Manner of taking Measure, or (as one may say) *Gaging* his Heroes by each other, and thereby elevating the Character of one Person by the Opposition of it to that of some other whom he is made to excell'.³ Diomedes, for instance, gains in stature as each new opponent whom he meets is more formidable than the last; his exploits in turn serve to exalt Hector who triumphs over him; while the cumulative effect of both heroes' exploits finally redounds to the credit of Hector's victor Achilles.

There follow some remarks on Homer's weapons, in the course of which Pope notes that Homer describes a past age, and does not introduce into his picture the habits of his own day. In his similes, on the other hand, he introduces features from his own times unknown in the earlier period when the actions he describes took place. Pope seems to have been the first to make this important observation.⁴

1 Observations on Book I, §xxiii. For a later appreciation of Homer's character drawing see Beattie, *Essay on Poetry and Music*, part I, ch. 4 (*Essays*, 1778, pp. 79 f.).

2 Of those who object to being distracted by a simile Pope says: 'Those may as well imagine we lose the Thought of the Sun, when we see his Reflection in the Water; where he appears more distinctly, and is contemplated more at ease than if we gaz'd directly at his Beams. For 'tis with the Eye of the Imagination as with our corporeal Eye, it must sometimes be taken off from the Object in order to see it the better.' Thus Homer's similes serve at the same time to distract the attention and to make the scene clearer (p. 324).

3 P. 326.

4 Finsler calls it his 'most important discovery' (*Homer in der Neuzeit*, p. 329).

These and other observations in his preface, notes and appendices show Pope's understanding of Homer's art. To him Homer was not primarily the great religious and moral teacher that he had been to many earlier readers; nor was he what he later became, the impersonal voice of a primitive age. He was not the bard, in any sense, but the poet, the highly skilled practitioner of the art of epic poetry.

Many questions other than the purely literary inevitably gather round Homer. Some of these were discussed in the *Essay on the Life, Writings and Learning of Homer*, by Thomas Parnell, which accompanied Pope's translation. Parnell shows a healthy scepticism towards the ancient authorities and rejects most of the traditional stories about Homer's life. He is prepared to say little more than that he flourished about 1000 B.C., some 300 years after the fall of Troy, that he was born in Chios or Smyrna, that he travelled in Greece and Egypt and that he died at Chios. He attempts to extract his character from his works, and concludes that he had an unbounded curiosity, was a man of judgment, of a warm temper and lively behaviour, though pleasant and affable; that he was of a religious spirit, a lover of his country and of mankind in general; cheerful, sociable and not averse to the female sex. Finally, from his silence about himself he draws the conclusion that he was a very modest man.¹

In his discussion of the history of Homer's writings in the ancient world Parnell assumes that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as we have them are what Homer wrote. The story of Pisistratus collecting the scattered parts into one poem is explained as the restoration of an order which had been disturbed. On Homer's religion as on other subjects he shows the good sense of his age. 'His books', he writes, 'are now no longer the scheme of a living religion, but become the register of one of former times.'² He maintains, however, that Homer wrote with a moral purpose and rejects the view that he aimed only at pleasing. Finally, he illustrates Homer's learning. It had been a favourite thesis of later antiquity that Homer was master of all arts and sciences, and it was still thought right for scholars to discuss Homer's knowledge of history, geography, rhetoric, natural science, medicine, etc. On this not very profitable topic Parnell sums up by observing that Homer possessed all the knowledge of his own time

¹ Pope's *Iliad* (1715), I, pp. 28-30.

² P. 25.

and also laid the foundation of sciences that were later brought to perfection.¹

The first book devoted exclusively to Homer was that of the Aberdeen professor, Thomas Blackwell, who has appeared in an earlier chapter. His *Enquiry into the Life and Writings of Homer* (1735) cannot perhaps be justly described as exclusively devoted to Homer, for he does not in fact say a great deal on his subject. But in spite of his prolixity and irrelevance, and in spite of his affected style, his book was not without originality.² He sets out to explain how it was that so great a poet arose at so early a period. He draws a picture of the background of Homer's life and work, using, in an uncritical way that contrasts with Parnell's scepticism, any of the ancient evidence that suits his purpose. He finds that all the circumstances of Homer's life were particularly suited to the production of genius, the climate of Asia Minor, the state of civilisation—not too advanced to destroy simplicity and naturalness—and the language—already developed by earlier poets and well suited to express the sublimest emotions. Homer himself was a wandering minstrel; he had acquired his wisdom and knowledge from his travels; in Egypt he had learnt the Egyptian theology and science; and from the Phoenicians he had gained a knowledge of the non-Greek world. He had the good fortune to find his subject ready for him, given by tradition, and had no need to invent. He knew the scenes he described; he knew also, not the actual heroes of his story, but men like them. The picture of Homer that emerged from Blackwell's book was thus different from the conventional picture of the conscious artist and the conscious moralist. Blackwell attempts to do something new, to explain Homer by putting him in his historical background. He attributes his genius not to inspiration or art but to a happy conjunction of circumstances and the ability to represent nature truthfully.

Homer's characters, according to Blackwell, were taken from men as they were, and were neither more nor less admirable. 'The *natural Greek*,' he writes, 'in *Homer's* days, covered none of his Sentiments;

¹ p. 62.

² 'Unter den für der weiteren Fortgang der Homerischen Forschungen wichtigen, ja bahnbrechenden Werken' (Volkmann, *Geschichte und Kritik der Wolfischen Prolegomena*, p. 14).

He frankly owned the Pleasures of *Love* and *Wine*: He told how voraciously he *eat* when he was hungry; and how horribly he was *frighted* when he saw an approaching Danger: He look'd on no means as base to escape it; and was not at all ashamed to relate the *Trick* or *Fetch* that had brought him off.¹ This picture of the Homeric hero as the *Naturmensch*, the man who lived simply and naturally, without any inhibitions, was eagerly accepted by Herder, and, from him, by Goethe. In England Blackwell caused less excitement. Yet his book no doubt had a considerable influence and helped to popularise a new attitude towards Homer. It served to weaken the belief in Homer as the moral teacher. Bossu, who had long been regarded as the authority on epic, and who had carried the moralistic interpretation of Homer to absurd lengths,² lost favour. In the later eighteenth century he was regarded with scant respect. His theories were dismissed by Blair as 'frigid and absurd', and by Twining as 'disgusting nonsense'.³

For Englishmen the representative figure of the eighteenth century is Dr Johnson, and it may be of interest at this point to note what he had to say about Homer. One does not expect to find much about Greek literature in his writings or conversation, for his classical learning, massive though it was, was overweighted on the Latin side. Homer, however, is the one Greek poet with whom he shows an intimate acquaintance,⁴ and, though Macaulay believed that he preferred Pope's translation to the original, there is no doubt of the

1 *Op. cit.* (1735), p. 328.

2 He held that Homer's aim in the *Iliad* was to preach the blessings of political unity, and that he had invented his plot in order to point his moral, just as Aesop had composed his fables, and might equally well have chosen beasts as men for his characters.

3 Blair, *Lectures*, p. xlii (ed. 1817, vol. III, p. 192); Twining, *Aristotle's Poetics*, p. 561 note d. Beattie, however, believes 'the fatal effects of dissension among confederates and of capricious and tyrannical behaviour in a sovereign' to be 'the leading moral of Homer's poetry' (*Essay on Poetry and Music (Essays)*, 1778), p. 79).

4 He once remarked that he had never read through the *Odyssey* completely in the original (Boswell, *Life of Johnson* (ed. Hill), I, p. 70). But he had certainly read the *Iliad* in the original and knew the *Odyssey* fairly well. According to Boswell he was a good, though not a great Greek scholar. He occupied himself during his last illness by translating epigrams from the *Anthology* into Latin. See J. Gennadios, *Dr Johnson and Homer* (1924).

admiration he felt for him. We are told that he venerated Homer as the prince of poets;¹ on his merits, if on no other subject, Lord Monboddo and he were in happy agreement. They discussed the subject of Homer's characters. 'There are', said Johnson, 'in Homer such characters of heroes, and combinations of qualities of heroes, that the united powers of mankind ever since have not produced any but what are found there'—Monboddo. 'Yet no character is described'—Johnson. 'No, they all developè themselves'.² On one occasion Johnson and Burke debated the comparative merits of Homer and Virgil, Johnson taking the part of Homer, but no details of the debate are recorded.³ On another occasion Johnson remarked that the dispute as to the comparative excellence of Homer and Virgil was inaccurate. 'We must consider (said he) whether Homer was not the greatest poet, though Virgil may have produced the finest poem. Virgil was indebted to Homer for the whole invention of the structure of an Epick poem and for many of his beauties.' Elsewhere we find him saying of Virgil, 'Take from him what is in Homer, what do you leave him?'⁴

From the mid-eighteenth century onwards genius and originality were increasingly prized above learning and obedience to authority; nature, not 'nature methodis'd', was looked on as the prime source of poetry. The term 'original' made its appearance in critical writings in the early eighteenth century;⁵ later in the century the ideas associated with it were taken up by a number of writers, some of whom referred specifically to Homer as an example of original genius, one who was inspired directly by nature. Edward Young, for instance,

1 Boswell, *Life of Johnson* (ed. Hill), II, p. 129.

2 Boswell, *Tour of the Hebrides*, Aug. 21. Cf. Shaftesbury's remarks: Homer 'describes no Qualities or virtues: censures no Manners: makes no Encomium, nor gives Characters himself; but brings his Actors still in view. 'Tis they who show themselves' (*Characteristicks*, treatise III, part I, section 3 (1711)).

3 Boswell, *Life of Johnson* (ed. Hill), III, p. 193.

4 *Ibid.*

5 Pope regarded Homer as less original than Shakespeare. 'If ever any author deserved the name of an *Original*, it was Shakespear. Homer himself drew not his art so immediately from the fountains of Nature; it proceeded through Egyptian strainers and channels and came to him not without some tincture of the learning or some cast of the models of those before him' (*Preface to Shakespeare*, *Pope's Works* (ed. Bowles), IX, p. 475).

the poet of *Night Thoughts*, in his *Conjectures on Original Composition* (1759), made a fervent plea for originality, for the direct imitation of nature rather than of the ancients, and claimed that the ancients themselves had followed nature. Homer had done without rules and had relied on the native force of his mind. 'Tread in Homer's steps', he writes, 'to the sole fountain of immortality; drink where he drank, at the true Helicon, that is at the breast of Nature.'

The most interesting of the eighteenth-century books on Homer¹ was written under the influence of these ideas. This was Robert Wood's *Essay on the Original Genius of Homer*, privately printed in 1767 and published in 1769 and again in 1775 after the author's death. Wood was not a professional scholar, but a traveller and an under-secretary of state under Pitt and his successors. He was an enthusiastic lover of Homer, and a man of both sense and sensibility. He had not a great deal of learning, but he had the advantage of having travelled in Asia Minor and read Homer among the scenes which he described.

Wood's point of view is indicated in his title. He speaks of Homer's 'amazing power of original imitation',² a phrase which may seem a little odd unless we bear in mind that all poetry was thought of as imitation; the original writer was distinguished from others by his direct imitation from nature. Wood sums up his argument thus: 'The more we consider the poet's age, country and travels, the more we discover that he took his scenery and landscape from nature, his manners and character from life, his persons and facts (whether fabulous or historical) from tradition, and his passions and sentiments from experience of the operations of the human mind in others, compared with, and corrected by, his own feelings.'³

His observations made on his travels enabled him to vindicate Homer's geography and his description of landscape. He showed how much of Homer's geographical description could be explained by his having written in Asia Minor. For this reason the Locrians are 'beyond Euboea', and the West Wind blows from Thrace. Wood noticed how the Ionian point of view is especially clear in the similes.

¹ Nothing need be said of the *Critical Dissertations on the Iliad* (1760), by Roger Kedington, rector of Kedington, an attempt to prove that Homer never nods.

² p. 295 (ed. 1775).

³ p. 294.

His travels had not only convinced him of the accuracy of Homer's descriptions; they had also given him an insight into the manners of Homeric heroes. He had lived with Arab chieftains who had the same fierceness and violence as was found in Homer, the same simplicity of manners, the same hospitality to strangers.

Wood has not much respect for ancient tradition or for the interpretations of scholars. A text of Homer and an observant eye were his critical weapons, rather than the learning of centuries. He rejects the allegorical interpretation of Homer's religion and mythology. 'Nothing can be more contrary to our idea of the character of his writings, and to that unbiassed attention to the simple forms of Nature, which we admire as his distinguishing excellence.'¹ He is scornful of the view that Homer embodied in his theology the mysterious wisdom of Egypt; it was drawn, according to him, from no other source than 'the comprehensive observation of Nature, under the direction of a fine imagination and a sound understanding'.² The formula is not perhaps wholly adequate to the explanation of religious ideas; however, Wood successfully shows that the scenery of Homer's mythology is Greek, and is derived from observation. He is as sceptical of moral interpretations as of allegorising. He finds no profound system of ethics and politics, but simply a free and impartial representation of life. But this is not to deny the moral value of Homer. A true picture of men, good and bad, can teach more effectively than the systems of the philosophers.

Wood's book was translated into several languages and was widely read on the continent. It owed its success to the qualities which make it still readable to-day, its freshness and enthusiasm, and the knowledge of Homeric lands on which it was based. As Finsler says, 'one can easily understand how powerful must have been the effect when people saw the Homeric world clearly before their eyes, free from all the accumulated dust of centuries'.³

The criticism of Homer was not unaffected by the growth of interest in literatures other than classical which took place in the latter part of the century. Homer might now be compared not with writers such as Virgil who had followed in his footsteps, but with those of a different tradition. In 1762 Richard Hurd published his

1 p. 116.

2 p. 126.

3 *Homer in der Neuzeit*, p. 368.

Letters on Chivalry and Romance, one of the first symptoms of a growing interest in the Middle Ages. Hurd makes a novel and interesting comparison between the heroic times as described by Homer and what he calls the Gothic ages. Love of war was common to Homeric heroes and mediaeval barons. Their habits and morals were in many respects similar; both combined fierceness with generosity and courtesy. In both ages there was a delight in games and tournaments, in both the bard was welcome at the chieftain's table. Hurd considers that the advantage for poetry lies with the later period, although in fact it produced no Homer; if Homer had experienced the feudal ages he would, so Hurd asserts, have preferred them to his own, on account of their 'improved gallantry and the superior solemnity of their superstitions'.¹ Hurd found in the elves and fairies, witches and magicians of Gothic romance something that he missed in Homer, something which he described as 'more amusing as well as more awakening to the imagination'.²

To Hurd Tasso and Spenser represented the literature of the Gothic age. But there was a less artificial and more authentic expression of the age in the old English ballads, which were popularised by Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* (1765). Homer and the ancients generally lost something of their unique position by the discovery of this native literature. None of these anonymous ballad poets could be seriously claimed as a rival to Homer. But in the 1760's a rival did appear, a rival of rather doubtful credentials, from the mists and mountains of Scotland, bearing the name of Ossian. Such was the lure of the primitive and of the voice of nature that for a brief period there seemed to be nothing fantastic in putting Macpherson's tawdry rhetoric on the same level as Homer.

Hugh Blair in his *Critical Dissertation on the Poems of Ossian* (1763) has a lengthy comparison of Homer and Ossian, in which the Highland poet scores some points over the Greek. Homer, according to Blair, is of all great poets the one most similar to Ossian; both lived in a rude primitive society, both were 'originals', who wrote 'the poetry of the heart', taught by nature rather than art. Homer had a wider knowledge and a greater diversity; but Ossian's ideas if few were those best fitted for poetry. 'Both poets are eminently

1 Letter VI (*Works*, 1811, IV, p. 281

2 *Idem*, p. 282.

sublime; but a difference may be remarked in the species of their sublimity. Homer's sublimity is accompanied with more impetuosity and fire; Ossian's with more of a solemn and awful grandeur. Homer hurries you along; Ossian elevates, and fixes you in astonishment. Homer is most sublime in actions and battles; Ossian in description and sentiment. In the pathetick, Homer, when he chuses to exert it, has great power; but Ossian exerts that power much oftener, and has the character of tenderness far more deeply imprinted on his works. . . . With regard to dignity of sentiment, the pre-eminence must clearly be given to Ossian.¹ In character drawing Homer is undoubtedly supreme, but Ossian is at least equal, if not superior to Virgil, and the character of Fingal surpasses any of Homer's heroes. In similes, in which both authors abound, Homer has the advantage of variety, but Ossian's, unlike Homer's, are always taken from 'objects of dignity'.² In many cases the two poets make similar comparisons. The great objects of nature, says Blair, are common to all poets;³ an explanation that did not occur to him was that Macpherson knew his Homer.

Another writer who compared Ossian and Homer was John Gordon, Archdeacon of Lincoln, who is said to be the author of the anonymous *Occasional Thoughts on the Study and Character of Classical Authors* (1762). Gordon writes with some vigour and shrewdness, and his attack on the classical education has the distinction of unorthodoxy. He attacks it not with the familiar utilitarian arguments, but on the grounds that it discourages curiosity and rational inquiry, and fosters a greater attention to words than to things. As regards literature he is an example of the superficial rebel against authority and tradition. He admires Ossian for his pictures of nature, and regards the ancients as men who turned their backs on nature. Unlike most of his contemporaries, he included Homer in this indictment.

Admirers of Ossian might perhaps be expected to welcome another production of Macpherson, his translation of the *Iliad*. It appeared in 1773, and was written in the style of the Ossianic poems, in a kind of rhythmical prose. The opening paragraph will give an idea of this literary curiosity:

1 Blair, *Dissertation on Ossian*, p. 23.

2 *Idem*, p. 53.

3 *Idem*, p. 56.

'The wrath of the son of Peleus,—o goddess of song, unfold!
The deadly wrath of Achilles; To Greece the source of many woes!
Which peopled the regions of death,—with shades of heroes untimely
slain: while pale they lay along the shore: Torn by beasts and birds
of prey: But such was the will of Jove! Begin the verse, from the
source of rage,—between Achilles and the sovereign of men.'

Macpherson's Ossian had many admirers, but his Ossianised Homer fell flat. It was regarded as a poor joke, and was soon forgotten.

Pope's Homer had no serious rival until the end of the century, when Cowper translated the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in 1791. Cowper's translation was largely inspired by the desire to avoid Pope's faults,¹ to be as accurate as possible, to omit nothing and add nothing, and to reproduce that simplicity that Pope had noted as a Homeric quality but had ignored in his version. As a translator Cowper was more self-conscious than Pope; he realised the problems and the difficulties. He had not Pope's confidence and at times felt wholly dissatisfied with his efforts. We find him searching for a style; at first he tried to reproduce 'the quaintness that belonged to our writers of the fifteenth century' in the hope of surging the simplicity of the original.² But this did not satisfy him, and he removed the quaintness. Finally, he chose as his medium the blank verse of his admired Milton.³ The result is a simple, straightforward, unrheterical version, with a noticeable Miltonic colouring. It has the merit of honesty, but is somewhat slow-moving, and as Cowper himself put it, 'deficient in the grace of ease'.⁴

The Homeric question as the nineteenth century knew it scarcely existed in the eighteenth century. The radical speculations of the Abbé d'Aubignac⁵ had no influence, were indeed probably quite unknown in England, and Wolf's *Prolegomena* did not appear until 1795. The general belief of antiquity that Homer existed, and that he

1 Cf. *Correspondence of William Cowper* (ed. Wright, 1904), II, p. 394.

2 *Idem*, III, p. 446.

3 He held an exaggerated view of the similarity of Homer and Milton. Pref. to 1st ed. p. xxix, to 2nd ed. p. xl (ed. 1802).

4 Pref. to 2nd ed. p. xliii (ed. 1802).

5 D'Aubignac in his *Conjectures Académiques* (1715, written some years earlier) maintained that there was no such person as Homer, that the *Iliad* had no plan, and that it consisted of a number of separate poems combined together.

wrote the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, was accepted without question. Yet there were passages in the ancient authorities which might suggest that the Homeric poems were not originally a unity; the most accessible was that in *De Oratore* recording the tradition that Pisi-stratus arranged the books of Homer which were previously scattered. This and similar passages in Pausanias and Aelian were of course known to scholars before Wolf, but they explained them, as we have seen Parnell did, as referring to the restoration of an original order that had been disturbed in the process of time. When in the course of Johnson's tour to the Hebrides Mr McQueen, recollecting perhaps the story in Cicero, remarked that Homer was made up of detached fragments, Johnson contradicted him, saying that it had been one book originally, as was shown by the fact that you could not put any book out of its place.¹

Bentley, however, seems to have thought otherwise, if we may judge by the *obiter dictum* in his *Remarks* on Anthony Collins's *Discourse of Free Thinking*. Collins had praised Homer in the conventional way of his time as one who had designed his poems for all eternity to please and instruct mankind. Bentley answered in his vigorous way: 'Take my word for it, poor Homer, in those circumstances and early times, had never such aspiring thoughts. He wrote a sequel of songs and rhapsodies, to be sung by himself for small earnings and good cheer, at festivals and other days of merriment; the *Ilias* he made for the men, and the *Odyseis* for the other sex. These loose songs were not collected together in the form of an epic poem till Pisistratus's time, above 500 years after.' From this it appears that Bentley thought of the Homeric poems as a number of short lays which were not combined into an epic until long after; on the other hand, to him Homer was a historical character, the author of the short poems which a later editor made into the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

When he wrote of Homer singing for small earnings and good cheer Bentley was no doubt thinking of Homer's own picture of the bards Demodocus and Phemius, and of wandering minstrels in other societies. Blackwell also depicts Homer as a bard or minstrel. According to his picture the bard's compositions were to a large

1 Boswell, *Tour to the Hebrides*, Sept. 8.

extent impromptu; his imagination was fired as he recited, and he suited his poem to the demands of his listeners. This view of Homer as an improviser is hard to reconcile with the art and elaboration of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Of this problem Blackwell seems to have been unaware. It was later raised by John Brown, who in the course of his *Dissertation on . . . Poetry and Music* (1763) pointed out the difficulty of believing that an epic as complex and perfect as the *Iliad* 'should at once emerge in all the Extent of Art, in the midst of rude and unformed Fables, sung at Festivals as vague Enthusiasm might inspire'.¹

Robert Wood in his *Essay on the Original Genius of Homer* made some remarks which had an important influence on the development of the Homeric question. In the course of his chapter on Homer's language and learning he asked a question which had not previously exercised scholars:² How far was writing known to Homer? He found that there was no allusion in Homer's poems to this art (for the σήματα λυγρὰ of the letter carried by Bellerophon were hieroglyphics rather than alphabetic writing), and argued that it was not introduced into common use in Greece until about 554 B.C. How could Homer have acquired and communicated all he knew without the aid of letters? Wood answered that memory flourished in an unlettered age, and that verse helped to preserve what, if composed in prose, could only have been preserved with the help of writing. Homer's poems then were delivered and handed down by word of mouth. There was no copy until Pisistratus, or some other person, committed them to writing. This involved editing and reducing to order. The work of the editor Wood compared to that done by Macpherson to the poems of Ossian.

This theory that writing was unknown to Homer was developed by Wolf and formed the foundation of his *Prolegomena*. By his observations on the site of Troy Wood also helped to start a controversy that flourished at the turn of the century. This question belongs rather to archaeology than to literary criticism, and is dealt with in a later chapter. One of the protagonists however, Jacob Bryant,³ deserves brief mention here, for he touched on wider

¹ Brown, *Dissertation*, p. 104.

² Except d'Aubignac, who was not known to Wood.

³ 1715-1804.

questions than the purely topographical and his unorthodox theories won some notoriety, though little support. Bryant was the author of *A new System or An Analysis of Antient Mythology*, in three volumes (1774-6), an ingenious and wrongheaded work, full of hazardous etymological speculations. His Homeric theories are indicated in the title of his chief work on the subject, *A Dissertation concerning the War of Troy and the Expedition of the Grecians as described by Homer; . . . shewing that no such Expedition was ever undertaken and that no such City as Phrygia existed* (1796). Bryant is a tedious repetitive writer, and his arguments are puerile and confused. He appears to think of the whole of ancient mythology as one system that stands or falls together, so that if there are any inconsistencies, the whole is unhistorical. As a specimen of his argument it may be mentioned that he finds that Helen was aged 114 at the time of the fall of Troy, and concludes that at that advanced age she could not have been beautiful enough to attract Paris, therefore no expedition took place.¹ He believes, however, that there was a Troy in Egypt, and that the story of the siege of Troy originated there. Homer himself was born in Ithaca, whither his family had migrated from Egypt; he had himself travelled in Egypt, and had gathered the materials of his poems there, as well as in his native Ithaca.

It would be wrong to think of Bryant as a pioneer of 'the Homeric question'. He was merely an eccentric traditionalist, behind his times in his uncritical and unhistorical use of ancient evidence. His methods of arguing are quite different from those of his contemporary Wolf. Whatever may be the truth of Wolf's thesis, to read him after Bryant is to learn the difference between good and bad historical criticism.

One of the few English scholars to accept Wolf's theories was Gilbert Wakefield. He believed that there was no person called Homer; the name simply meant 'blind', and referred to the blind bards who composed short poems on detached episodes of the Trojan

¹ *Dissertation* (2nd ed. 1799), pp. 21-3. 'The age of Helen', writes Lempriere, 'has been a matter of deep enquiry among the chronologists.' If she was born of the same eggs as Castor and Pollux, she could not have been less than sixty years old at the fall of Troy. But 'we must suppose that her beauty remained long undiminished and was extinguished only at her death' (*Classical Dictionary*, s.v. Helena).

war. 'These songs of *blind men* were collected and put together by some skilful men (at the direction of Pisistratus, or some other person) and woven by interpolations, connecting verses, and divers modifications into a whole.'¹ But Wakefield in this, as in other respects, was a heretic. Even in 1830 the Wolfian theories, though widely accepted in Germany, had made little headway in England.² They were indeed but little discussed; none of the leading English scholars of the early nineteenth century concerned themselves with the problem.³ As Milman wrote in 1831, 'the established opinion maintains its ground rather by ancient prescription than by the strength put forward in its defence'.⁴

A rather feeble attempt to defend the traditional view of Homer was made by Granville Penn in his *Primary Argument of the Iliad*, 1821. He assumes that the sole ground of Wolf's hypothesis was the lack of unity of plot in the *Iliad*, and attempts to prove this unity by showing that the main theme of the poem is not the wrath of Achilles, but 'the sure and irresistible power of the divine will over the most resolute and determined will of man—exemplified in the death and burial of Hector by the instrumentality of Achilles—as the immediate preliminary to the destruction of Troy'.⁵ This point he expounds at length, and only deals briefly with the external arguments against the unity of Homer.

A more important antagonist of the German theories was Richard Payne Knight, whose edition of Homer with Prolegomena was published in 1820, the Prolegomena having appeared first, privately printed, in 1808. Knight is a vigorous advocate, who claims to represent common sense against pedantry. He points out how slight is the authority for the story of Pisistratus's recension of Homer; Herodotus, Thucydides, Plato and Aristotle know nothing of it. And in any case the story means the restoration of an order that had been lost rather than the putting together of poems originally com-

1 Letter to Fox No. IX (1798) (*Correspondence of Wakefield with Fox*, p. 29). That Wakefield derived these ideas from Wolf is likely, since there is no hint of them in his Observations, prefixed to his edition of Pope's *Odyssey* (1795).

2 See H. N. Coleridge, *Introductions to the Study of the Greek Classic Poets*.

3 As Sandys points out, Elmsley shows little interest in the question in his review of Heyne's Homer (*History of Classical Scholarship*, III, p. 57).

4 *Quarterly Review*, XLIV, p. 125.

5 *Primary Argument*, p. 164.

posed separately.¹ Moreover, the apparent unity of the Homeric poems could hardly be the result of chance. 'It is surprising that so many poets should, without consulting together, by some lucky chance, have treated the same theme in such a way that their separate poems, as it were of their own accord, fitted together so well that all succeeding ages regarded the resulting works as perfect models.'² Against Heyne, who had objected to the irrelevance or inconsistency of certain episodes in Homer, Knight appeals, effectively enough, to common sense. 'The original hearers of the poems were not so critical as to inquire into the reason for such incidents; nor did their credibility depend on nice questions of congruity; students of Homer must be constantly reminded that the old bards did not use the language of professors, did not sing to scholars and grammarians or to any such subtle critics; their hearers were men who indulged their feelings freely and openly and undisguisedly, who had not overlaid their natural emotions with philosophy and the learning of the schools, or blunted their force by the refinements of civilization.'³

But it was not criticisms such as these that gave Knight's edition its fame and caused the term *Knightianism* to be bandied about by German Homeric scholars.⁴ It was rather the peculiarities of his text. He disagreed with Wolf's thesis that in constituting the text of Homer we cannot get beyond that of the Alexandrians; he aimed at restoring the original. His *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were, so his title page claimed, 'a rhapsodorum interpolationibus repurgata, et in pristinam Formam . . . tam e veterum monumentorum fide et auctoritate quam ex antiqui sermonis indole et natura redacta'. The result is peculiar. Not only does he entirely omit those lines that he considers to be interpolations (thus he does not print the end of the *Odyssey*, from line 297 of book XXIII⁵), but he has many unfamiliar spellings, and introduces the digamma with great frequency. The *Iliad* becomes $\Phi\Lambda\Phi\Lambda\Sigma$, and its opening lines run thus:

ΜΗΝΙΝ αφειδε, θεα, πηλεφιαδαφ' αχιλεφος
ολομενην, ι-η μυφρι' αχαφοισ' αλγε εθηκεν,
πολλας δ' ιφθιμοφς πσυφχας αφιδι προιαπτσεν.

1 Prolegomena, §§ IV, v.

2 § IX.

3 § XXIII.

4 See Cauer, *Grundfragen der Homerkritik* (ed. 1921), p. 77.

5 In rejecting the conclusion of the *Odyssey* he was following the Alexandrian scholars Aristophanes and Aristarchus.

This curious production has been described by a German writer as 'a piece of dilettante capriciousness, such as only an Englishman is capable of'.¹

Payne Knight also revived the theory of the ancient χωρίζοντες, who held that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were not the work of the same poet. The differences of language and style and of the manners and beliefs described in the two poems made him put the *Iliad* one hundred years earlier than the *Odyssey*.² This view, that the two poems were the work of different authors, found some support in England in the early nineteenth century. It was adopted by H. N. Coleridge in his *Introductions to the Classic Greek Poets*,³ and by Milman in his review of Coleridge's book in the *Quarterly*.⁴ This review also contains some effective criticisms of the Wolfian thesis. Milman stresses the unity of design of the Homeric poems and the consistency of their characters. The question of writing he admits is difficult; he suggests that perhaps it was known in Homer's day, though not in that of his heroes. The absence of any reference to the art may thus be a piece of archaism. Moreover, he is not convinced of the impossibility of composing long poems without the aid of writing. Like Knight he questions the authority of the story about Pisistratus and his collecting of songs previously scattered; and he adds what seems to have been a new point, that there is no sign of Attic influence in the poems as we have them, either in the language or in the matter, and that therefore any extensive Athenian editing is unlikely.

Thus the traditional view of the authorship of the Homeric poems was still generally accepted at the end of our period. But Homer no longer held the unique position that had been his at the beginning of the eighteenth century. One hesitates to say that he was now less read; certainly the *Iliad* still maintained its place in the school curriculum⁵ and Pope's Homer was still popular. But there were

1 Volkmann, *Geschichte und Kritik der Wolfischen Prolegomena zu Homer*, p. 167.

2 His date for the *Iliad* was 1100-1050 B.C.

3 p. 285 (2nd ed. 1834).

4 XLIV, p. 160.

5 The *Odyssey* was comparatively neglected in the eighteenth century. Essayists occasionally entered a mild protest against this neglect and endeavoured to demonstrate the beauties of the poem. Joseph Warton contributed some

now other Greek writers who claimed more attention than had previously been given to them. No longer could it be said that 'Homer will be all the books you need'. Taste had changed. The ideal of the heroic epic had ceased to dominate the minds of critics, and the ancient authorities no longer enjoyed the same prestige. The men of letters of the early nineteenth century have comparatively little to say about Homer. If Coleridge is the typical critic of the period one can easily see by comparing him with Pope how Homer had receded into the background. Coleridge was much more interested in drama than in epic. Moreover, he accepted the German theory of the authorship of Homer. He frequently and confidently maintained that the *Iliad* was a collection of poems by different authors, put together at the time of Pisistratus.¹ He denied unity to the existing poem. Many of the books, he remarked, might change place without any injury to the thread of the story; the poem had 'no rounded conclusion'.² Elsewhere, rather inconsistently, he called it 'a poem perfect in its form', but went on to say: 'But if I wish my feelings to be affected, if I wish my heart to be touched, if I wish to melt into sentiment and tenderness, I must turn to the heroic songs of the Goths, to the poetry of the Middle Ages.'³ We have travelled a long way from Pope, who knew little of the songs of the Goths and despised what he knew, and who turned to the father of poetry as the source of the critic's maxims and the poet's practice, the model to be read by day and meditated by night.

papers on the subject to the *Adventurer*, and it is the theme of one of Vicesimus Knox's *Essays Moral and Literary* (no. CLXXV). These essayists and others who wrote on the *Odyssey* (e.g. Richard Hole, *Essay on the Character of Ulysses*, 1807) were mainly concerned to point out the excellent moral lessons to be drawn from it. According to H. N. Coleridge in 1830, the *Odyssey* was still neglected in schools. He echoes the earlier protests against this neglect, but adds a new reason why the poem should be read. 'It is as pregnant with moral and prudential wisdom [as the *Iliad*], as full of life and variety, and much more romantic' (*op. cit.* p. 316). 'Quid virtus et quid sapientia possit utile proposuit nobis exemplar Ulixen.' Yes, but more was now required of poetry than useful examples. The nineteenth century was to discover the 'romance' of the *Odyssey*.

1 *Table Talk*, May 12, 1830, July 9, 1832; Scott, *Diary*, Apr. 22, 1828; Raysor, *Coleridge's Miscellaneous Criticism*, p. 160.

2 *Ibid.*

3 Raysor, *op. cit.* p. 12.

CHAPTER XI

Greek Poetry. Drama and Lyric

'Although the conduct of the drama may be admitted to have received some improvements, yet for poetry and sentiment we have nothing to equal Sophocles and Euripides; nor any dialogue in comedy that comes up to the correct graceful and elegant simplicity of Terence. We have no such love elegies as those of Tibullus: no such pastorals as some of Theocritus's and for lyric poetry Horace stands quite unrivalled.'

HUGH BLAIR

LORD CHESTERFIELD in one of his letters refers to Anacreon, Theocritus and Homer as writers of whom all smatterers in Greek 'know a little, quote often and talk of always'.¹ In the earlier eighteenth century this rather ill-assorted selection of authors comprised the Greek reading of the ordinary educated man. The Attic dramatists were on the whole neglected except by professional scholars, and for most readers Greek poetry meant either the heroic or the rococo, the *Iliad* on the one hand and on the other the slighter products of Alexandria and of later antiquity.

To the eighteenth century 'Anacreon' meant not so much the genuine fragments, though many of these were included in the editions then in use, as the poems which we now know as the Anacreontea. It was not till the mid-nineteenth century that these graceful imitations were recognised as spurious and lost some of their reputation; until then they were widely read and much admired. To quote Vicesimus Knox: 'The gay, the sprightly, the voluptuous Anacreon is known to every reader.'² Throughout the century there was a constant stream of translations, nor did the stream dry up in the nineteenth century. Best known of the translators is Thomas Moore, whose version, written when he was an undergraduate at Dublin and brought with him to London, started him on his literary

¹ *Letters* (ed. Mahon), II, p. 57.

² *Essays Moral and Literary*, p. clxxviii. 'It has been objected to him', Knox remarks, 'by rigid moralists that his writings tend to promote drunkenness and debauchery.' But, he goes on, 'a man of sense and judgment will admire the beauties of a composition without suffering its sentiments to influence his principles or his conduct'.

career. The rest were obscure versifiers, men with a little culture and mild literary ambitions. The editors of the *Oxford Book of Greek Verse in Translation*, after a study of these forgotten volumes, found them all inferior to the mid-seventeenth-century version of Thomas Stanley, the editor of Aeschylus.

Some of the translators of Anacreon also tried their hands at others of the lesser Greek poets. Francis Fawkes published in 1760 *The Works of Anacreon, Sappho, Bion, Moschus, and Musaeus*. He followed this with a version of Theocritus in 1767; and his Apollonius Rhodius was published posthumously in 1780, edited by Henry Meen. While Fawkes's translations were generally admired, those of E. B. Greene were received with ridicule. He translated the same authors as Fawkes, with the exception of Theocritus, and also attempted Pindar, with small success. Another translator whose works attest the popularity of Alexandrian literature is Richard Polwhele, a clergyman in Devon and Cornwall, who published in 1786 translations of Theocritus, Bion, Moschus and Tyrtæus.¹

Another popular poet of the eighteenth century was Lycophron, who was held in high esteem. To Wakefield he was 'as delightful as any of the Ancients'. 'I have read him', he writes to Fox, 'very often, and always with additional gratification.'² Fox himself read Lycophron with Payne Knight and apparently enjoyed the reading,³ while the younger Pitt, as has already been recorded, studied him as an undergraduate at Pembroke. Viscount Royston, son of the Earl of Hardwicke, when an undergraduate at Cambridge in the early nineteenth century produced a verse translation of the *Cassandra*, which was privately printed, with notes, in 1806.⁴ To these distinguished students of Lycophron may be added a humble name, that of Henry Meen, Minor Canon of St Paul's, a mild and unassuming clergyman, who produced *Remarks on the Cassandra* in 1800, preparatory to an edition which never saw the light.

1 Dr Dodd, the forger, translated Callimachus in 1755.

2 *Correspondence of Wakefield with Fox*, p. 120.

3 Parr's *Works*, VII, p. 304; *Correspondence of Wakefield with Fox*, p. 128.

4 Lycophron appears to exercise a peculiar fascination over the young. Lord Royston's translation was written at the age of 19, the same age at which Scaliger had made his Latin version of the poem and Potter had begun on his edition.

Pindar does not appear to have been generally popular until the latter part of the eighteenth century, and it was probably the imitations of poets such as Gray which brought him into favour. He had indeed always been regarded with a certain veneration (he is one of the four ancient poets who appear in Pope's *Temple of Fame*), but perhaps he was more venerated than studied. As Basil Kennet said in 1697, 'His Poems are of so difficult a Character, that the Greatest Judges are commonly satisfied with confirming his General Title of Prince and Father of Lyriques, without engaging in the search of his particular Excellencies.'¹ Moreover, Pindar's name was somewhat discredited by its association with the 'Pindaricks' of Cowley and his school. Cowley had made popular a form of ode believed to be that of Pindar, and at any rate agreeing with Horace's description 'numerisque fertur lege solutis'. Throughout the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, a number of these Pindaricks appeared, incoherent, turgid, rambling and irregular in metre.

Congreve first pointed out how Pindar had been misrepresented by his imitators.² He maintained that Pindar himself was not only regular in his metres but also coherent in his ideas. In spite of his digressions and sudden transitions, there was always some connection of thought. In his own imitations of Pindar Congreve adopted a regular metrical scheme, and made strophe correspond with antistrophe and epode with epode.³ The same scheme was followed by Gray in his *Progress of Poesie* and by others of his school, such as Gilbert West,⁴ who translated some of Pindar's *Odes* in 1749. The volumes known as West's Pindar in fact contain a good deal besides Pindar. There are translations of twelve of the odes; the other contents consist of miscellaneous translations (including the whole of *Iphigenia in Tauris*), original poems, and a long *Dissertation on the Olympick Games*. West in his Preface pointed out, as Congreve had done before him, the regularity of Pindar's structure and the coherence

¹ *Lives and Characters of the Ancient Grecian Poets*, p. 73.

² *Discourse on the Pindarique Ode*, prefixed to *A Pindarique Ode on the Victorious Progress of Her Majesties Arms* in Congreve's Works (1710), vol. III.

³ Before Congreve, and before Cowley, the scholarly Ben Jonson had written a correct and regular Pindaric in his *Ode on the death of Sir H. Morison*.

⁴ Son of Richard West, collaborator with Leonard Welsted in an edition of Pindar.

of his thought. He also deemed it necessary to defend him against those who thought his subjects lacking in dignity and imagined the Greek victors as mere 'Prize Fighters and Jockeys'. Pindar's poetry he finds to be characterised by 'a poetical Imagination, a warm and enthusiastick Genius, a bold and figurative Expression, and a concise and sententious Stile'.¹

It has already been remarked that Greek drama was not much read in the early eighteenth century. The evidence of translations confirms this; the standard eighteenth-century versions of the tragedians all belong to the latter half of the century. The dramatists did not, like Homer, attract poets of the distinction of Pope and Cowper. Francklin, Potter and Wodhull are known only as translators. Nor did their versions ever attain wide popularity. According to Coleridge, while Pope's Homer was in everybody's hand, the translations of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides were found only in the libraries of those who did not want them and made scarcely any impression on the community at large.²

There was probably a wider knowledge of 'those rules of old discover'd, not devis'd' than of the actual Greek drama. The precepts of Aristotle and the later interpretations of his theory had more influence than the plays on which the theory was founded. The neo-classic theory of drama did not, however, exercise any tyranny in this country; loyalty to Shakespeare made it hard for Englishmen to submit to the rules, and in the latter part at any rate of the eighteenth century the classicist theory was generally abandoned. Dr Johnson's Preface to Shakespeare showed once and for all that there was no rational ground for observing the unities; it remained for Twining to show definitely, what had been half known before, that apart from the unity of action they were not even supported by the authority of Aristotle.³

More than one of the eighteenth-century critics was at pains to point out that whatever might be the merits of the Greek dramatists

1 Preface, p. xv.

2 Lectures of 1811-12. Raysor, *Coleridge's Shakespearian Criticism*, II, p. 83. Dr Johnson admitted that his studies 'had not lain amongst' the Greek tragedians (Hill, *Johnsonian Miscellanies*, II, p. 78).

3 Twining, Aristotle's *Poetics*, p. 226.

their practice was not necessarily relevant to the modern stage, that they were, in fact, to be considered historically. Lord Kames pointed out that the unities were a necessity to the Greeks, since their stage had no curtain, and their drama was a continuous representation without interruption.¹ The differences between ancient and modern drama could be largely explained by the institution of the chorus. As Blair pointed out,² the chorus was the original element from which the drama developed; it had not been consciously adopted for the purpose of adorning and improving the drama.³ As time went on its function gradually decreased, until in modern drama it had disappeared altogether. Hurd went so far as to say that the form of Greek drama was a matter of pure chance, and had resulted solely from the circumstances of its origin.⁴ This point of view appears later also in Coleridge, though he adds a new-fangled notion from Schlegel, that the chorus is 'the ideal representative of the real audience'.⁵

Thus it was recognised that Greek drama was the result of certain historical conditions, and consequently there was no tendency to regard it as above criticism. Hume complained of the 'want of humanity and decency' sometimes displayed,⁶ and Twining considered that Greek tragedy had never attained to its proper dignity, but always kept certain elements of meanness—'the familiar, the jocose, the coarse, the comic'.⁷ Blair disapproved of the intervention of gods,⁸ and Lord Kames found in the Greek drama absurdities and improprieties.⁹ Kames, a didactic Scotsman with small first-hand

1 *Elements of Criticism*, ch. XXIII.

2 *Lectures on Rhetoric*, XLV (ed. 1817, III, p. 279).

3 Clearly a more reasonable view than that of another Scots professor, Beattie, who explained the chorus by the fact that 'great persons like those who appear in tragedy engaged in any great action are never without attendants or spectators or those at least who observe their conduct and make remarks on it' (*Essays* (1778), p. 12).

4 *Works* (1811), II, p. 69.

5 Raysor, *Coleridge's Shakespearian Criticism*, I, p. 174, cf. II, p. 82. 'He had tried to show that the construction of the Greek drama was owing to pure accident.'

6 *Essay on the Standard of Taste* (*Works*, 1854, III, p. 271).

7 Aristotle, *Poetics*, p. 200.

8 *Lectures*, XLV (ed. 1817), III, p. 276.

9 *Op. cit.* ch. XIV and XXIII.

knowledge of Greek literature, is very ready, while claiming for the moderns a freedom from ancient standards, to judge the ancients by standards of his own. He is disgusted by the 'irrational and absurd' belief of Orestes in the *Choephori* that he is bidden by the oracle to kill his mother, yet must be punished for it. And he finds it equally absurd that in the *Electra* Orestes should be affected by his own false report of his death. 'Such imbecility can never find grace with a modern audience: it may indeed produce some compassion for a people afflicted with absurd terrors, similar to what is felt in perusing a description of the Hottentotes; but such manners will not interest our affections, or attach us to the personages represented.'¹

Such strictures are the result of a criticism which is more concerned to consider what drama should be than what it is. From critics of this sort we do not expect a sympathetic insight into the character of the Greek tragedians. There were, however, others less contentious and dogmatic who expounded in the language of the day the beauties of the Attic tragedians. Francklin's *Dissertation on Tragedy* appended to his translation of Sophocles² contains a summing up of the literary character of the three masters which may be quoted as showing the views of a Cambridge professor of the mid-eighteenth century who was also a London literary man.³ 'Aeschylus', we read, 'is a bold nervous animated writer; his imagination fertile, but licentious, his judgment true but ungoverned; his genius lively but uncultivated; his sentiments noble and sublime, but at the same time wild, irregular and frequently fantastic; his plots, for the most part, rude and inartificial; his scenes unconnected, and ill-placed; his language generally poignant and expressive, though in many places turgid and obscure, and even too often degenerating into fustian and bombast; his characters strongly marked, but all partaking of that wild fierceness which is the characteristic of their author.' Sophocles is the prince of the ancient dramatists; 'his fables . . . are interesting and well chosen, his plots regular and well conducted, his sentiments elegant, noble and sublime, his incidents natural, his diction simple, his manners and characters striking, equal and unexceptionable, his choruses well adapted to the subject, his moral reflections pertinent

1 Ch. XIV, *fin.*

2 Ed. 1809. Not in the first edition.

3 pp. 44-52. There is a similar summing up in Blair's *Lectures*, XLVI.

and useful, and his numbers in every part to the last degree sweet and harmonious.' Euripides is somewhat unequal in plot and character drawing, but his sentiments are 'remarkably fine, just and proper, his diction soft, elegant and persuasive'. There is much that is coarse and vulgar in him, such as to shock the refined taste of the moderns, but, on the other hand, these defects are compensated by his tenderness and pathos. He had not so sublime a genius as Aeschylus, nor so perfect a judgment as Sophocles, but he wrote more to the heart than either. He was the Correggio of ancient drama, while Aeschylus was the Julio Romano and Sophocles the Raphael.¹

The latter part of the century saw a certain widening of literary interests, a breaking down of the bounds of a narrow classicism, and a more liberal appreciation of the different characters of authors ancient and modern. The increased interest in old English literature may have drawn some away from the classics; others perhaps were saved from a merely conventional admiration and led to look at the ancients with less awe but with greater affection. An interesting picture of the tastes of the later eighteenth century is provided by the letters and journals of Thomas Twining, the country parson who edited Aristotle's *Poetics*.² He was a man of varied interests and individual tastes. He combined a sound classical scholarship with an appreciation of scenery, art and music, of Chaucer, Percy's *Reliques* and Chatterton's Rowley poems. He edited Aristotle with a learning of which he was slightly apologetic, and a determination not to be awed by tradition and authority. 'The time is come', he says, 'when we no longer read the ancients with our judgments shackled by determined admiration.'³ His own judgments, as given in his letters, are based solely on individual taste, not on convention, nor on any

1 Potter also is fond of the analogy from painting. According to him Euripides was to Aeschylus 'what Raffaele was to Michael Angelo' (Preface to Euripides). The scenery of the *Prometheus* 'would require the utmost effort of Salvator Rosa's genius' to represent it (Preface to *P.V.*). That of the *Supplices* 'would have well employed the united pencils of Poussin and Claude Lorain' (Preface to *Supplices*).

2 Twining, *A Country Clergyman of the Eighteenth Century* (1882).

3 Aristotle's *Poetics*, p. xii. Another translation of the *Poetics*, with lengthy notes, that of H. J. Pye, poet laureate, appeared in 1788. It is less scholarly than Twining's, but informed by the same desire to show Aristotle as he is.

moral predilections. To him the Greek tragedies were not perfect and finished models but 'the rude imperfect sketches of men of genius'.¹ He prefers La Fontaine to Phaedrus, and the old song 'Balow my babe' to Simonides's *Danae*.² He finds Pindar overrated. 'There are here and there fine poetical strokes in him, and moral maxims well expressed but he is very unequal, often very tiresome, very obscure, and to us moderns very uninteresting.' Here almost for the first time we have what may be called a 'modern' attitude towards the Greeks; they are judged subjectively, by the amount of pleasure they give the reader.

Another country clergyman, without Twining's learning or intelligence, had a greater influence on English Hellenism. This was Robert Potter,³ author of verse translations of all three tragedians. He was curate and schoolmaster at Scarning in Norfolk, later vicar of Lowestoft, a man of impressive appearance, tall and handsome. 'He was', we are told, 'a scholar of the old school; and nothing tempted him to relinquish divine and polite literature.'⁴ His translation of Aeschylus appeared in 1777; it was followed by Euripides (1781-3) and Sophocles (1788). His Sophocles did not succeed in supplanting that of Francklin; on the other hand, his Euripides was generally preferred to that of Wodhull, which appeared at about the same time.⁵ His Aeschylus, considered his most successful work, was the first, and for many years the only, English translation of that poet.

Scholar of the old school though he was, Potter showed an unconventional admiration for Aeschylus. The enthusiasm with which he writes of his poet in the preface to his translation contrasts with the faint praise hitherto accorded to him. The prevailing opinion of the later eighteenth century may be seen from Andrew Dalzel's professorial lectures. 'Between Aeschylus and the other two', he says, 'there is no comparison. But Sophocles and Euripides have divided the learned.'⁶ In the early and mid-eighteenth century Sophocles

1 *Country Clergyman*, p. 27; cf. Aristotle's *Poetics*, p. 207.

2 *Country Clergyman*, pp. 32, 123.

3 1721-1804.

4 Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, II, p. 306.

5 1782. Michael Wodhull (1740-1816) was a rich man and a noted book collector.

6 Dalzel, *Substance of Lectures*, II, p. 203.

was generally awarded the palm; later, when sensibility took the place of good sense, the tender Euripides was preferred. Aeschylus was commonly regarded as a venerable monument of antiquity, one whose works were good in their day but were surpassed by the later dramatists. The devotion to Aeschylus of Fielding's Parson Adams was an eccentric taste, not shared by others of that period.¹ Porson in his Cambridge prelection maintained that a preference for Aeschylus was a pardonable error due to a prejudice in favour of the original inventor; his own favourite was Euripides. Charles James Fox also preferred Euripides to either of the other tragedians. In Aeschylus he found too much of the grand and terrific and gigantic, and not enough of the tender or pleasant or elegant.²

What offended some in Aeschylus would attract others. Those who prized the original genius and the poetry of nature would not object to his supposed turgidity and bold irregularity. We find John Brown in 1763 describing Aeschylus in terms similar to those in which Wood wrote of Homer: 'His Writings present to us all the Characters of a sublime original and uncultivated Genius, which scorned any other Tutor than *Nature*.'³ We do not, however, find any extensive cult of Aeschylus as the poet of Nature. An original genius could not make a wide appeal if obscured by a difficult and corrupt text; and the scholars who could understand him were perhaps most likely to adhere to old standards of criticism.

One popular writer of the later eighteenth century shows an unbounded enthusiasm for Aeschylus. This was Richard Cumberland, Bentley's grandson, a prolific playwright, who for a time conducted a periodical, the *Observer*, modelled on the *Spectator*. In this, interspersed with miscellaneous articles—'Tragic story of a Portuguese gentleman', 'Of the Lama of Tibet', 'Account of a Ghost, from the Narrative of a Clergyman', etc.—is a good deal of information about

1 It was in fact the taste of the Rev. William Young, the original of Parson Adams, who, we are told, was remarkable for his intimate acquaintance with the Greek writers, and was as passionate an admirer of Aeschylus as Parson Adams (Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, III, p. 371). According to Cross (*History of Henry Fielding*, I, p. 45) Fielding himself had never read Aeschylus in the original.

2 *Memorials and Correspondence of Charles James Fox*, IV, p. 461.

3 *Dissertation on . . . Poetry and Music*, p. 84.

ancient Greece, such as would hardly have appeared in the periodicals of Addison's day. He begins with *An Athenian Dream*, an imaginative reconstruction of a scene in Ancient Athens, perhaps the earliest attempt at anything of this sort.¹ There follows a history of Greek literature, by no means scholarly or critical and largely based on ancient biographical anecdotes. He makes up, however, in enthusiasm what he lacks in scholarship. For him Aeschylus is the great tragedian, and the *Agamemnon* is 'a wonderful production'. 'Though no other tragedy but this had come down to us from the pen of the author, it would be a matter of astonishment to me that any critic should be found of such proof against its beauties as to lower its author to a comparison with Sophocles and Euripides.'² He pays Aeschylus the same compliment that Potter had paid him, the highest compliment possible for an Englishman, that of comparing him with Shakespeare. Sophocles, on the other hand, is 'in the line with' Rowe and Euripides with Lillo.³

In the early nineteenth century the main contribution to the study of Greek drama came from the scholars of the school of Porson, who provided a number of valuable editions which enabled the educated man to read the tragedians with greater ease and a finer appreciation of their language and style than had been possible before. Their work was not accompanied by any attempt to popularise by new translations or by a new critical appreciation. Coleridge, who by his knowledge of the classics and his sensibility and originality of thought was best fitted to interpret Greek drama to the new age, was inclined to be unsympathetic towards the Greeks. He owned himself 'gratified' but not moved by Homer,⁴ and he once remarked that he could find nothing sublime in Greek literature.⁵ His unbounded enthusiasm for Shakespeare led him to depreciate Greek drama. He is sometimes dogmatic and unsympathetic, as when in his lectures he says: 'In dramatic composition the observation of the unities of time and place so narrows the period of action, so impoverishes the sources of pleasure, that of all the Athenian dramas there is scarcely one in which the absurdity is not glaring, of aiming at an object and utterly

1 *Observer*, VII, VIII.

2 *Idem*, LIV.

3 *Ibid.*

4 Raysor, *Coleridge's Miscellaneous Criticism*, p. 12.

5 *Table Talk*, July 25, 1832.

failing in the attainment of it.¹ Yet we turn to his *Table Talk* and find that his theories had not dried up his sympathies and sensibility and that he could discourse appreciatively on the Greek dramatists: 'When I was a boy I was fondest of Aeschylus; in youth and middle age I preferred Euripides; now in my declining years I admire Sophocles. I can now at length see that Sophocles is the most perfect. Yet he never rises to the sublime simplicity of Aeschylus—simplicity of design, I mean—nor diffuses himself in the passionate outpourings of Euripides. I understand why the ancients called Euripides the most tragic of their dramatists; he evidently embraces within the scope of the tragic poet many passions—love, conjugal affection, jealousy, and so on, which Sophocles seems to have considered as incongruous with the ideal statuesqueness of the tragic drama. Certainly Euripides was a greater poet in the abstract than Sophocles. His choruses may be faulty as choruses, but how beautiful and affecting they are as odes and songs.'²

Coleridge has some suggestive things to say on ancient literature, though they are not always convincing. 'The Greeks, except perhaps in Homer, seem to have had no way of making their women interesting, but by unsexing them, as in the instances of the tragic Medea, Electra etc.'³ This is the sort of observation which invites contradiction, but for which we are nevertheless grateful. By such *obiter dicta*, sometimes capricious and wrong-headed, but generally novel and stimulating, rather than by his more ambitious theorising, Coleridge contributed to the appreciation of literature, ancient as well as modern.

The Old Comedy found few admirers in the eighteenth century. To that age comedy meant rather, to use Gillies's words, 'the elegant and ingenious, the moral and instructive strains of Molière and Menander'.⁴ Menander, and after him Terence, provided the norm for comedy, and it was hard to appreciate something written on a completely different model, depending on gaiety, imagination, satire and buffoonery rather than on plot, character-drawing and love

1 Coleridge, *Lectures on Shakespeare and Milton*, 1811-12, Lecture IX.

2 *Table Talk*, July 1, 1833.

3 Raysor, *Coleridge's Miscellaneous Criticism*, p. 37.

4 Gillies, *History of Greece*, I, p. 486.

interest. Moreover, the eighteenth century, which, whatever its morals, believed in propriety in literature, disliked Aristophanes's obscenity,¹ whereas in the following century, usually accounted so prudish, this feature was on the whole condoned. Aristophanes, being thus condemned by the prevailing taste, was seldom read. Even the fact that St Chrysostom kept his plays under his pillow, a fact mentioned occasionally in Aristophanes's defence, did not increase the number of his readers. Fox, a keen lover of Greek poetry, knew nothing of him,² and Gilbert Wakefield, who had read Lycophron very often, found himself unable to read Aristophanes through.³

As we have seen in an earlier chapter, the most popular play for school reading was the least Aristophanic and the nearest to new comedy, the *Plutus*. It was this play that Fielding translated, in collaboration with William Young. Their intention was to translate all the plays, but the doubt expressed in the preface, whether Aristophanes's simplicity of style would be to the taste of readers used to the comedy of the day, was evidently justified, for no further volumes appeared, and the 'very large dissertation on the Nature and End of Comedy, with an account of its Original, Rise and Progress to this day', remained unwritten.

The preface, which seems to be the work of Fielding, speaks of Aristophanes's 'good Sense, manly Wit, just Satire, and true Humour'.⁴ The more generally accepted view was that of a writer of 1759, who described Aristophanes as 'a scurrilous buffoon, whose name ought long ago to have been buried in oblivion'.⁵ So too Beattie, somewhat later, professed himself unable to discover any-

1 Gillies describes the Old Comedy as 'this hideous spectre' and 'this odious and disgusting form' (*op. cit.* I, p. 483).

2 Letter to Trotter, IV. *Memorials and Correspondence of Charles James Fox*, IV, p. 446.

3 *Correspondence of Wakefield with Fox*, p. 175.

4 Elsewhere however he classes him with Rabelais as one who 'attempted to ridicule all sobriety, modesty, decency, virtue and religion out of the world' (quoted Cross, *op. cit.* II, p. 433).

5 *Monthly Review*, May 1759, p. 462. Horace Walpole called Aristophanes a blackguard (*Letters*, ed. Toynbee, XIII, p. 283). But he knew little of Greek.

thing in Aristophanes that might not be consigned to eternal oblivion without the least detriment to literature.¹

Beattie's remarks prompted a reply from one who could appreciate wit and independence as well as he could appreciate Attic idiom. Porson's review of Brunck's Aristophanes contains a vigorous defence of the poet: 'To sum up Aristophanes's character, if we consider his just and severe ridicule of the Athenian foibles, his detestation of the expensive and ruinous war in which Greece was engaged, his pointed invectives against the factious and interested demagogues, by whom the populace was deluded, "who bawl'd for freedom in their senseless mood"; his contempt of the useless and frivolous inquiries of the Sophists; his wit, and versatility of style; the astonishing playfulness, originality and fertility of his imagination; the great harmony of versification, whenever the subject required it, and his most refined elegance of language; in spite of Dr Beattie's dictum, we shall look over his blemishes, and allow that with all his faults, he might be a very good citizen and was certainly an excellent Poet.'²

Porson's known love of Aristophanes ensured that he would not be neglected by those scholars who came under his influence. Outside these circles he won an increased popularity in the early part of the nineteenth century, a popularity due in part to a change in literary taste, in part to an increased interest in Greek history, and so in a writer who threw so much light on the social and political life of Athens.³ Richard Cumberland at the end of the eighteenth century did something to popularise Aristophanes by his papers in the *Observer*, in which he praised the purity of his style, the poetry of his choruses, his good sense and the justice of his satire, and defended his attacks on Socrates, which had apparently not been forgiven by the philosopher's admirers. Cumberland was also the author of a translation of the *Clouds* which proved popular. Chief among those who were instrumental in spreading an interest in Aristophanes in the early nineteenth century was Thomas Mitchell,⁴ who translated

¹ See p. 12.

² Porson, *Tracts and Criticisms*, p. 15.

³ The influence of the brothers Schlegel, who gave high praise to Aristophanes, was not without effect in England.

⁴ 1783-1845. Fellow of Sidney Sussex, 1809-12. Edited Aristophanes 1834-8, and later (1844) some plays of Sophocles.

the *Acharnians*, the *Knights* and the *Wasps*, and contributed a series of articles to the *Quarterly Review* on Aristophanes and on the social and intellectual history of Athens.¹ Mitchell's view of ancient Greece was somewhat coloured by conservative prejudices; he shared Mitford's low view of the Athenian demos; he thoroughly disliked the sophists and thought the *Laws* of Plato his most noble and perfect work. He did not, however, see Aristophanes simply as an anti-Jacobin; he could appreciate his gaiety and imagination. As a translator he was later to some extent eclipsed by Frere and Rogers; but he had many merits, among them an appreciation of Aristophanes's metrical variety, to which he was the first translator to do justice. The rigid metrical conventions of the eighteenth century had to be broken down before an adequate translation of Aristophanes could be made. Mitchell in his use of anapaestic and trochaic metres, of internal rhymes and feminine endings, showed the way to later translators of the nineteenth century.

¹ *Quarterly Review*, March 1813, Apr. 1819, July 1819, May 1820, Jan. 1821, July 1822, July 1823, March 1826, Feb. 1831.

CHAPTER XII

The Poets and Greece

Greece! how I kindle at thy magic name,
Feel all the warmth and catch the kindred flame.

THOMAS WARTON

THE LITERATURE of Greece, perfect in form and rich in intellectual and imaginative power, has inevitably influenced the literatures of Europe. It supplied Rome with the forms in which she expressed herself, and through Latin literature its influence lived on when Greek was forgotten. The Renaissance brought not only a return to classical models but the recovery of the Greek language, and the possibility of a direct approach to Greek literature. In England there has never been any firmly established 'classical' tradition of literature, but there have been a large number of poets who have known Greek and as a result of their individual studies have owed something to Greece. There is sufficient richness and variety in Greek literature to provide inspiration to men of various temperament and in different periods. One has only to think of the names of Milton, Gray, Shelley, Keats, Arnold, Swinburne, all of whom can claim to be in some degree Hellenists, to see how variously the influence of Greece can work.

Awed by the prestige of the ancients there have been some who have held that the only way to achieve distinction was to follow as closely as possible in their footsteps and to produce exact imitations of their writings. There is, however, another kind of imitation, of which Longinus speaks: ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀρχαίων μεγαλοφυΐας εἰς τὴν τῶν ζηλούντων ἐκείνους ψυχᾶς ὡς ἀπὸ ἱερῶν στομάτων ἀπόρροιαί τινες φέρονται.¹ Herodotus, Stesichorus, Archilochus and Plato were Ὀμηρικώτατοι, though they wrote no epics. Many moderns too have been inspired by the Greeks to create something new of their own, which may be very different in spirit from the original. The emanations flow to Shelley's heart from Aeschylus and Plato and

¹ Long. XIII, 2.

produce *Hellas* and *Prometheus Unbound*, *Epipsychidion* and *Adonais*. Keats discovers the Greek legends at third hand and creates a dream world of sensuous beauty which is far from anything Greek. Some, such as Gray and Landor, learn from Greece a formal perfection, compression and reticence; others let their fancy roam freely in the ancient world, and are hellenist without being classicist.

In general the literature of the earlier eighteenth century was Roman rather than Greek in spirit. We recognise the kinship with Rome by speaking of the age of Pope and Addison as Augustan. Greece was seen through the medium of Rome; it was part of the classical tradition, the tradition of later antiquity recovered at the Renaissance and as yet unbroken. It is significant that Greek and Roman mythology were confused together, and the gods and goddesses were known by their Latin names. It was long before this usage was abandoned. It is no surprise to find Pope writing Jupiter, Juno and Minerva for Zeus, Hera and Athene, but it is rather a shock to find Shelley following the same practice. It was not until well into the nineteenth century, after Thirlwall and Grote had accustomed their readers to the original names of the deities, that Greek mythology was separated from Roman. Moreover, the conventional poetic diction of the eighteenth century, the source of which is to be found in Latin rather than in Greek literature, gives a somewhat un-Greek character even to translations or direct imitations of Greek originals.

In the eighteenth century the *Iliad* was the acknowledged model of epic poetry, and, while, as we have seen, the Greek tragedians did not hold the same position as Homer and were by no means exempt from criticism, the classical drama was on the whole in high repute. Consequently we find attempts made to write both epic and drama on the Greek model. Glover's *Leonidas* and Wilkie's *Epigoniad* were both heroic epics founded on Homer, and taking their subject matter from Greek history or legend. They are now completely forgotten, and it is unnecessary to do more than mention them here. Nor have the classical dramas of the eighteenth century more than a historical interest. It will suffice to mention a few plays founded on the Greek which were acted on the London stage in our period. James Thomson, the poet of the Seasons, wrote an *Agamemnon* which was performed

with some success in 1738.¹ William Whitehead's *Creusa, Queen of Athens*, based on the *Ion*, was acted in 1754. Glover, the author of *Leonidas*, wrote a *Medea*, which was performed in 1767;² the *Hecuba* of John Delap was put on the stage in 1761, and his *Royal Suppliants* twenty years later.

One poet of the mid-eighteenth century, Mark Akenside, though he did not write ambitious epics or dramas on the model of ancient Greece, looked to some extent to Greece for inspiration and succeeded in giving a noticeably Grecian colour to some of his poetry. His *Hymn to the Naiads* is modelled on Callimachus and draws its mythology direct from Greek poetry, while he successfully attains an Attic simplicity in, for example, the first of his *Inscriptions*. He ends the first book of *The Pleasures of Imagination* with an invocation to the 'Genius of Ancient Greece'.

Guide my way
Through fair Lyceum's walk, the green retreats
Of Academus, and the thymy vale,
Where oft enchanted with Socratic sounds
Ilissus pure devolved his tuneful stream
In gentle murmurs. From the blooming store
Of these auspicious fields may I unblamed
Transplant some living blossoms to adorn
My native clime: while far above the flight
Of fancy's plume aspiring I unlock
The springs of ancient wisdom! While I join
Thy name, thrice honour'd! with the immortal praise
Of Nature; while to my compatriot youth
I paint the high example of thy sons
And tune to Attic themes the British lyre.³

The theme with its combination of Greek philosophy and nature is more familiar to us than it was in 1744, when for the most part Ilissus devolved his tuneful stream to deaf ears. Of the Socratic sounds which that stream had heard none would have been more

1 Also a play founded in part on the *Alcestis*, *Edward and Eleanor*, which was not performed.

2 A continuation entitled *Jason* was published in 1799 but not performed.

3 *The Pleasures of Imagination*, I, l. 590 f.

congenial to Dr Johnson than the assertion in the *Phaedrus* that the sage has nothing to learn from fields and trees.

To Akenside Greece is the land of 'sages, heroes, bards', the land not only of poetry and a manly, freedom-loving youth, but of Socrates and Plato.

Could my ambitious hand entwine a wreath
Of Plato's olive with the Mantuan bay...¹

From Greek philosophy he has drawn the lesson that

Truth and Good are one
And beauty dwells in them.²

We have to wait until Shelley before we find another English poet who looks to Greek philosophy for inspiration. There were, however, in the mid-eighteenth century others besides Akenside who aspired to tune to Attic themes the British lyre. Gray, Collins and the brothers Warton all express high admiration for Greece and see in her a source of poetic inspiration, though the reticent Gray does not proclaim his admiration as the others do.

O bid our vain endeavours cease,
Revive the just designs of Greece.

So Collins concludes his ode to the Passions, and in the same way Joseph Warton exclaims, 'O bid Britannia rival Greece', and his brother Thomas echoes him in an ode on the birthday of George III, who, according to his laureate, 'bids Britannia vie with Greece'.

The poets of the school of Gray, as for convenience they may be called, were all men of academic education and considerable classical attainments. Joseph Warton was headmaster of Winchester; his brother Thomas professor at Oxford and editor of Theocritus. Collins had enough learning to begin a translation of the *Poetics*, and the mottoes and notes to his poems show his interest in classical literature. Gray himself had read all the Greek authors of any note and many minor ones. He was well acquainted with writers such as Plato, Aeschylus and Aristophanes who were out of fashion in his day, and he spent long hours over Pausanias, Athenaeus and Diogenes Laertius. It is interesting to note that Gray and the others of this

¹ *The Pleasures of Imagination*, I, l. 404.

² *Idem*, I, l. 374. In a note Akenside refers to Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, III, 8.

group, besides being lovers of Greece, were in the van of the movement of taste which led away from the classics to the Middle Ages and to literatures other than classical. Thomas Warton was indeed conscious of a conflict of allegiance between Gothic and classic. He owned himself 'a faithless truant from the classic page', one who loved the minstrelsy of the Middle Ages and the solemnity of the Gothic cathedral, until Reynolds's window in New College Chapel 'broke the Gothic chain' and brought him back to truth away from caprice and fancy.¹ But the conversion was not perhaps very thorough. The poet of *The Pleasures of Melancholy*, of ruined abbeys by moonlight, 'solemn glooms' and 'twilight cells and bowers' remained a Goth at heart, though Greece was often on his lips.² However this may be, 'Gothic' interests did not preclude a love of Greece, and the knowledge of Greek literature possessed by Gray and others of his school was in fact considerably wider and more sympathetic than had been usual in the earlier part of the century.

To this group of poets Pindar is above others the poet of Greece. Gray imitates the Pindaric ode, with its strophe, antistrophe and epode, in his *Progress of Poesie* ('a high Pindarick upon Stilts', as he calls it in a letter³) and in *The Bard*, and in the former at any rate borrows thoughts from his model. William Mason, Gray's admiring friend and biographer, himself the author of Pindaric odes, in his epitaph for his friend claimed him as the English Pindar:

No more the Grecian Muse unrivall'd reigns.
To Britain let the nations homage pay;
She felt a Homer's fire in Milton's strains,
A Pindar's rapture in the lyre of Gray.⁴

Collins has an ode or two in the Pindaric manner, though he does not observe the correct Greek scheme. He prefixes a motto from the

1 On Sir Joshua Reynolds' Painted Window at New College, Oxford (1782).

2 We even find him imagining himself invoking 'the genius old of Greece' in the incongruous setting of 'yon antique wood, Dim temple of sage solitude' (*Ode on the Approach of Summer*).

3 Correspondence of Thomas Gray (ed. Toynbee and Whibley), p. 364 (vol. 1).

4 Gilbert West's translations are a symptom of the interest felt in Pindar at this period. Joseph Warton greeted them in a Pindaric ode, in which he exclaims:

Hark! with fresh Rage and undiminish'd Fire
The sweet enthusiast smites the British Lyre.

Olympians to his *Odes Descriptive and Allegorical*, making his own Pindar's prayer for 'daring and all-embracing power'. But on the whole he does not attempt to reproduce the elaborate splendour of Pindar; his characteristic odes are in a simpler style, which might perhaps be considered more genuinely Greek than Gray's baroque elaboration.

To the Wartons Pindar is primarily the poet of patriotism, manliness and the love of freedom.

Pindar our inmost Bosom piercing, warms
With Glory's Love and eager Thirst of Arms:
When Freedom speaks in his Majestic Strain,
The Patriot-passions beat in every vein.

So writes Joseph Warton.¹ Thomas is moved to contrast the racing men of Newmarket with the victors celebrated by Pindar:

Who, fir'd with genuine glory's sacred lust,
Whirl'd the swift axle through the Pythian dust.
Theirs was the Pisan olive's blooming spray,
Theirs was the Theban bard's recording lay.

He passes on to contrast the ancient glories of Greece with its present state of slavery and degradation, and to warn his own country to beware of sharing the fate of Greece.²

The Greek dramatists too appear in the poetry of this period as objects of admiration. Joseph Warton joins Euripides and Sophocles to Homer.

Let me for ever thy sweet sons admire,
O ancient Greece, but chief the bard whose lays
The matchless tale of Troy divine emblaze
And next Euripides, soft Pity's priest,
Who melts in useful woes the bleeding breast;
And him who paints the incestuous king
Whose soul amaze and horror wring.³

¹ *Ode on West's Pindar*. Cf. Thomas Warton, *Ode on H.M.'s Birthday*, 1786:

'Twas thus Alcaeus smote the manly Chord;
And Pindar on the Persian Lord
His Notes of Indignation hurl'd.

Collins also looks on Alcaeus as a poet of liberty; he wrongly regards him as author of the Harmodius song (*Ode to Liberty*).

² *Newmarket, A Satire*.

³ *Ode on West's Pindar*.

Collins refers to Euripides in his *Ode to Pity* and to Aeschylus and Sophocles in his *Ode to Fear*. A lesser poet than Collins, William Mason, who belongs to the same group, attempted to revive Greek tragedy in his *Elfrida*¹ (1752) and *Caractacus* (1759). Though the subjects are taken from early British history the plays are professedly 'written on the model of the ancient Greek tragedy'. All the unities are observed, and in both plays there is a chorus—of British virgins in *Elfrida* and of Druids and Bards in *Caractacus*—which sings odes carefully composed in Strophe, Antistrophe and Epode. The plays were never put on the stage.

When we turn from the eighteenth century to the nineteenth we are conscious of a change in the relations between learning and literature. There is an estrangement between them which had scarcely existed in the previous century. The poets of the new century were not like Johnson and Gray at home in libraries and College common rooms. Keats left school at the age of 16; Shelley and Landor were sent down from Oxford; Coleridge ran away from Cambridge, and Byron regarded academic life and learning with unconcealed contempt. The scholars went their way and the poets went theirs, and they had little contact with one another. In the eighteenth century the poet and scholar were united in such a typical figure as Thomas Warton; but there is little in common between Elmsley and Dobree, on the one hand, and Keats and Shelley on the other. It is true that on both sides there is a love of ancient Greece, but it is a long way from the *Museum Criticum* to *Endymion* or *Hellas*.

Of the poets mentioned above Coleridge had the best academic record, for at Cambridge he had won a Browne Medal for a Greek ode and had been in the running for the Craven Scholarship. But his poetry owed nothing to the inspiration of Greece or its literature. Wordsworth too is little affected by influences from the ancient world, in spite of the Platonism of the Immortality ode, and his outburst in the sonnet 'The world is too much with us'. The desire to be a pagan suckled in a creed outworn was not a lasting one with him. In the preface to the 1815 edition of his poems he instanced the

1 'Boswell: Surely Sir, Mr Mason's *Elfrida* is a fine poem. . . . Johnson: There are now and then some good imitations of Milton's bad manner.' Boswell, *Life of Johnson* (ed. Hill), II, p. 235.

Bible, Milton and Spenser as 'the grand storehouses of enthusiastic and meditative Imagination'. These writers he preferred to those of Greece and Rome 'because the anthropomorphitism (*sic*) of the Pagan religion subjected the minds of the greatest poets in those countries too much to the bondage of definite form'.¹

To younger poets less theistic and more sensual than Wordsworth the anthropomorphism of Pagan religion gave it its charm. Shelley delights in the old mythology, and Keats laments its passing in the sonnet 'Glory and Loveliness have passed away', which he prefixed to his first volume of poems. The same nostalgia for a lost mythology of nature is expressed by Peacock:

In ocean's cave no Nereid dwells:
No Oread walks the mountain-dells:
The streams no sedge-crowned Genii roll
From bounteous urn; great Pan is dead:
The life, the intellectual soul
Of vale, and grove, and stream, has fled
For ever with the creed sublime
That nursed the muse of earlier time.²

Readers of Peacock's novels are familiar with his slightly ostentatious display of classical learning and the amused affection with which he portrays the lover of good food and good Greek. They may be less familiar with the romantic vein displayed in his poem *Rhododaphne*, from which the above quotation is taken, a tale of love and magic in a Greek setting, which moved Shelley to exclaim: 'This it is to be a scholar; this it is to have read Homer and Sophocles and Plato.'³ In truth there is little of Homer, Sophocles or Plato in the poem, but there is much feeling for the picturesque, for the beauties of the Mediterranean scene, and the charms of ancient mythology and ancient superstitions. Hurd in the eighteenth century had found the superstitions of the Middle Ages 'more awakening to the imagination' than those of Greece. Peacock reading the ancients with an imagination already awakened found a world of romantic charm that had been hidden from the previous century.

1 Wordsworth, *Prose Works* (ed. Grosart, 1876), II, p. 139.

2 *Rhododaphne*, Canto III.

3 Shelley's *Prose Works* (ed. Forman), III, p. 19.

Though the love of Greek mythology is in some degree a common element in the poets of this period, each has his own approach to Greece, and each must be considered separately.

The name of Byron is inevitably associated with Greece. He himself said that whatever was good in his poetry was inspired by Greece, and others have said the same of his life. But the inspiration came from modern rather than from ancient Greece. It was not the country's past that aroused his passionate interest so much as its present and its hopes for the future. Yet the mere fact that Greece was under foreign domination would hardly have been sufficient to engage his enthusiasm if there had not been the tradition of the country's ancient glory. The contrast between past and present inspires his appeals to the Greeks, and he loves to dwell on Thermopylae, Marathon and Salamis. To him ancient Greece is the land of heroic deeds, of manly virtue and freedom, as well as of poetry and art. He is a true child of the eighteenth century, and of the Whig tradition, which had always associated Greece and liberty;¹ but in him it was united with the revolutionary spirit of a new age.

Byron had had the usual public school grounding in classics. But he seems to have added little to his classical learning after his school days. He despised the professional scholars who prized 'Bentley's Brunck's or Porson's note More than the verse on which the critic wrote';² but it cannot be said that he himself showed much more interest in Greek poetry than in the scholars' notes. Apart from a few schoolboy translations from Anacreon and Euripides there is little sign in his works of any influence of Greek literature. Greek

¹ It is worth noting that the liberty with which Greece was associated was freedom from a foreign yoke rather than political liberty. Thus Sparta was perhaps more admired than Athens. Cf. Collins, *Ode to Liberty*, 'Who shall awake the Spartan life?' Thomas Warton calls Oxford 'As Athens learn'd, as Lacedaemon free' (*Triumph of Isis*). Cf. also the lines in his *Newmarket*:

Thy scenes sublime and awful visions rise
In ancient pride before my musing eyes.
Here Sparta's sons in mute attention hang,
While just Lycurgus pours the mild harangue;
There Xerxes' hosts, all pale with deadly fear,
Shrink at her fated hero's flashing spear.

² *Thoughts Suggested by a College Examination.*

mythology makes comparatively little appeal to him. For the material of his poetry he turns rather to the East, or to Italy, or to his own experience. One work of Greek poetry, however, made a strong impression on him, the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus. Of this he was 'passionately fond' as a boy.¹ When a reviewer commented on the likeness of his *Manfred* to the *Prometheus* he remarked: 'The *Prometheus*, if not exactly in my plan, has always been so much in my mind that I can easily conceive its influence over all or anything that I have written.'² Prometheus is the typical hero of the romantic, and we can well imagine that Byron identified himself in some degree with the rebel Titan.

Byron had a certain interest in Greek history, though little in Greek literature as literature. We find him reading Diodorus and Mitford's *History* in 1821; and he remarked of the *Iliad*, 'I venerated the grand original as the truth of *history*... and of *place*; otherwise it would have given me no delight.'³ For archaeological studies, however, he had no taste. 'Let's have a swim. I detest antiquarian twaddle', he said to Trelawny, when it was proposed that he should visit the antiquities of Ithaca.⁴ Nor had he much eye for the beauties of the extant buildings. When his companion remarked to him as they stood before the Parthenon, 'Well, this is surely very grand', his only reply, so it is said, was 'Very like the Mansion House'.⁵ It was with romantic rather than aesthetic feelings that he toured Greece. To him the buildings were a part of the country, the 'haunted holy ground'⁶ which the heroes of the past had trod.

And yet how lovely in thine age of woe,
Land of lost Gods and godlike men, art thou...
Thy fanes, thy temples to thy surface bow,
Commingle slowly with heroic earth.⁷

1 Letter to Murray, Oct. 12, 1817 (*Letters and Journals* (ed. Prothero), iv, p. 174). The *Prometheus*, the *Medea*, and the *Septem* were, he says, the only Greek plays which ever much pleased him.

2 *Ibid.*

3 *Letters and Journals* (ed. Prothero), v, p. 166.

4 Trelawny, *Recollections of the last days of Shelley and Byron* (ed. 1923), p. 136.

5 Rogers, *Table Talk* (ed. 1856), p. 241.

6 *Childe Harold*, II, lxxxviii.

7 *Idem*, II, lxxxv.

Byron's knowledge of Greek literature was the survival of a Harrow education; Shelley's was acquired mainly by his own efforts and comparatively late in life. At Eton he had dabbled in chemistry and read Monk Lewis; at Oxford he discovered Plato, but he soon turned away from the ancients to a materialistic philosophy and to schemes of social improvement. In 1812 he was writing to Godwin 'it certainly is my opinion. . . that the evils of acquiring Greek and Latin considerably overbalance the benefit. . . Was not the government of republican Rome and most of those of Greece, as oppressive and arbitrary, as liberal of encouragement to monopoly, as that of Great Britain is at present? And what do we learn from their poets? As you yourself acknowledged somewhere, they are fit for nothing but the perpetuation of the noxious race of heroes in the world.'¹ Less than ten years later he was to write: 'Never at any other period has so much energy, beauty and virtue been developed; never was blind strength and stubborn form so disciplined and rendered subject to the will of man, or that will less repugnant to the dictates of the beautiful and the true, as during the century which preceded the death of Socrates.'²

It was partly the influence of Peacock, whom he got to know in 1813, that sent him back to Greece. But it was in Italy that he really discovered the Greeks and fell under their spell. He read voraciously, chiefly Plato and the dramatists. Trelawny describes him 'Up at six or seven reading Plato, Sophocles or Spinoza, with the accompaniment of a hunch of dry bread', and sitting by a dark pool in a pine forest with his Aeschylus by him. In his pockets when his drowned body was recovered, were found two volumes, the poems of Keats and the plays of Sophocles.

He read the Greek poets in the Italian countryside with a background of blue skies and sparkling waters, and he dreamt of a Greece where all was light and beauty. In 1819 he visited Pompeii, and described it to Peacock. 'This scene was what the Greeks beheld (Pompeii, you know, was a Greek city). They lived in harmony with nature; and the interstices of their incomparable columns were portals, as it were, to admit the spirit of beauty which animates this glorious universe to visit those whom it inspired. If such was Pompeii,

1 Letter to Godwin, July 29, 1812.

2 *Defence of Poetry*.

what was Athens? . . . I now understand why the Greeks were such great poets; and above all, I can account, it seems to me, for the harmony, the unity, the perfection, the uniform excellence of all their works of art. They lived in a perpetual commerce with external nature, and nourished themselves upon the spirit of its forms.¹

So he formed his picture of an ideal Greece,

an antique region, on which fell
The dews of thought in the world's golden dawn
Earliest and most benign, and from it sprung
Temples and cities and immortal forms
And harmonies of wisdom and of song,
And thoughts, and deeds worthy of thoughts so fair.²

He ignored all that was ugly and mean in ancient Greece. While Byron read Mitford, and decided that after all the ancient Greeks were no better than their modern descendants, Shelley read Plato and Aeschylus and saw the columns of Pompeii against a clear blue sky, and wrote: 'The human form and the human mind attained to a perfection in Greece which has impressed its image on those faultless productions whose very fragments are the despair of modern art, and has propagated impulses which cannot cease, through a thousand channels of manifest or imperceptible operation, to ennoble and delight mankind until the extinction of the race.'³

With his sense of the beauty of ancient art, literature and life was joined an admiration, more conventional and shared with Byron and earlier poets, for the ancient home of freedom and for the people that had repelled the despotic invader at Marathon and Thermopylae.⁴ Yet he gives his characteristic turn to the old theme, when he dwells on the creations of art and thought that resulted from ancient freedom:

Athens, diviner yet,
Gleamed with its crest of columns, on the will
Of man, as on a mount of diamond, set;
For thou wert, and thine all-creative skill
Peopled, with forms that mock the eternal dead
In marble immortality, that hill
Which was thine earliest throne and latest oracle.⁵

¹ Shelley, *Prose Works* (ed. Forman), IV, p. 77.

³ Preface to *Hellas*.

⁴ See *Hellas*, ll. 54, 681.

² *Hellas*, prologue.

⁵ *Ode to Liberty*, v.

Shelley's love of liberty was more passionate and less fitful than Byron's, and though he had not the same intimate knowledge as Byron had of the Greek cause, he followed eagerly the progress of the Greek insurrection, and celebrated its successes and prophesied its triumph in his *Hellas*. Yet the *Hellas* whose freedom he prophesied was something different from the Greece for which Byron fought. It was that dream land of beauty, which became the symbol of the poet's hopes for the whole of humanity. *Hellas* ends with the famous chorus, 'The world's great age begins anew.'

Shelley's poetical works include some translations from the Greek—the *Cyclops*, the Homeric Hymn to Hermes, some works of Moschus, and a few poems from the Anthology. His choice of poems for translation was peculiar; of the Homeric hymns he chose the most light-hearted, and from extant Greek drama he selected the only satyric play. It is probable that he deliberately chose what was not very exacting to the translator, and did the work to occupy himself when he did not feel inspired to original production. When a piece of Greek poetry really moved him he was not content to translate; he was inspired to produce something of his own. The reading of Aeschylus resulted in *Hellas* and *Prometheus Unbound*, the former professedly modelled on the *Persae*, though very far from being a close imitation, the latter inspired by Aeschylus's *Prometheus Bound* and the accounts of his lost sequel. Shelley's play was not a reconstruction of Aeschylus's *Prometheus Unbound*, but a new interpretation of the legend. It would have been impossible without Aeschylus, yet he could say with some truth that it was original, and bore no resemblance to the Greek drama. He had no desire to challenge comparison with Aeschylus, nor could he accept his moral. 'In truth, I was averse from a catastrophe so feeble as that of reconciling the Champion with the Oppressor of Mankind. The moral interest of the fable, which is so powerfully sustained by the sufferings and endurance of Prometheus, would be annihilated if we could conceive of him as unsaying his high language and quailing before his successful and perfidious adversary.'¹ To Shelley Zeus is simply the symbol of tyranny, as Prometheus is of blameless suffering, and there can be no solution but the destruction of Zeus and the end of evil.

1 *Prometheus Unbound*, preface.

In form as well as in its moral *Prometheus Unbound* bears little resemblance to Greek drama; indeed, it bears little resemblance to any drama. Aeschylus wrote for the stage, and his characters, remote and superhuman though they are, have the outlines of human beings, and engage the interests and sympathies of the reader. Shelley's imagination was unfettered by the requirements of the stage. His scenes are laid in the clouds and in the heavens, and the nymphs and spirits who hover round are mere voices without form or body. Greek drama had quickened Shelley's imagination, but it had not taught him that the poet cannot pass too far beyond the bounds of the human, and that if he creates spirits he must give them sensible form.

From Shelley we turn to Keats, and here we are faced with a paradox. It is easy and natural to class the poet of *Endymion*, *Lamia* and *Hyperion* as a hellenist, yet his poetic qualities are wholly different from those most characteristic of Greece, and though he prayed to be given the 'old vigour' of the Greek poets,¹ he scarcely attained to it. Shelley's remark, 'He was a Greek', is conspicuously wide of the mark. As is well known, Keats knew no Greek. He once resolved to learn the language, and acquired a Greek grammar;² but the resolve came to nothing, and by the next year he had given up the idea.³ He was probably content to remain enchanted at a distance. The 'beautiful mythology of Greece', which gave him the subject of so much of his poetry, was all the richer in poetic suggestiveness because he saw it dimly from afar.

Byron, who disliked Keats's poetry, described him as 'versifying Tooke's *Pantheon* and Lempriere's *Dictionary*',⁴ and it has often been assumed that these were the main sources of his poems on

1. *Fragment of An Ode to Maia*.

2. Letter to Reynolds, Apr. 27, 1818 (*Letters of Keats* (ed. Forman, 1935), p. 137).

3. *Idem*, p. 425.

4. Letter to Murray, Apr. 26, 1821 (*Letters and Journals* (ed. Prothero), v, p. 269). *The Pantheon, representing the Fabulous Histories of the Heathen Gods and most illustrious Heroes*, by Andrew Tooke (1673-1732), was a translation from the *Pantheon Mythicum* of the Jesuit F. A. Pomey (1698). The 35th English edition appeared in 1824. The *Classical Dictionary* of John Lempriere (1765-1824), compiled while he was still an undergraduate at Oxford (1788), was for long the standard work of its kind.

classical legends. Certainly he possessed a Lempriere, if not two,¹ and his friend C. C. Clarke records his zealous study of the dictionary as a boy.² But it has been argued convincingly by de Selincourt that the main source of his knowledge and love of Greek legend is to be found rather in the earlier English poetry, which was his almost exclusive study after boyhood. 'Through his kinship, both in spirit and taste, with the Elizabethans, he became the poet of ancient Greece.'³ The Elizabethans knew the Greek legends, and used them as the material of poetry. Their treatment was more likely to have inspired Keats than the matter-of-fact biographies of the classical dictionary. 'It is time indeed', writes de Selincourt, 'that the Lempriere myth assumed its proper proportions and that it was fully recognised that Keats's classical inspiration was the inspiration of the Renaissance, as it appears in English literature from Spenser to Milton.'⁴

In one respect Keats's contact with Greece was immediate. If he did not know Greek literature at first hand, he had seen Greek works of art. In the Elgin marbles, which his friend Haydon expounded to him, he could see the forms of a past age still living and still beautiful,⁵ and from a Grecian urn he drew the message that 'Beauty is truth, truth beauty'. It is significant however, that, though no doubt he had seen original Greek vases, it was no one actually existing vase which inspired his ode, but 'a composite conjured up instinctively in his mind out of several such known to him in reality or from engravings'.⁶ His Grecian Urn, like his Greek mythology, was drawn from various sources and transfused by his own sensitive imagination.

It remains to mention one more writer, Walter Savage Landor, whose literary career began with the publication of his first poem in the year of Keats's birth and lasted almost until his death in 1864. A pupil of James of Rugby and a friend of Dr Parr, he was visited

¹ See *Letters of John Keats* (ed. Forman), p. 513.

² C. and M. C. Clarke, *Recollections of Writers*, p. 124.

³ *Poems of John Keats*, ed. de Selincourt (1905), p. xlv.

⁴ *Idem*, p. xlv.

⁵ Cf. *Endymion*, I, 318.

⁶ Colvin, *John Keats*, p. 416. For possible sources see Colvin, *l.c.* It is clear that Keats was thinking of neo-Attic marble urns, rather than of Greek vases in the ordinary sense of the term.

in his last years by Swinburne, and thus links the hellenism of the later eighteenth century with that of the later nineteenth. Yet he himself belongs to no period, and stands alone and apart. Some of his work falls outside the limits of our period, but by 1830 he had already shown his characteristic qualities—in his views a proud independence which sometimes degenerated into capriciousness, and in his poetry a classical refinement and precision of form.

Classicist though he was, he seems to have had no great claims to be a scholar. According to Parr, though he was an excellent Latin scholar, he had only 'some creditable knowledge of Greek'.¹ A spiritual kinship with the ancient world supplied the lack of deep scholarship; 'he was more himself of the antique Roman or Greek than a critical student of either tongue',² says Forster; Mrs Browning expressed a similar idea when she described him as 'the most classical of living writers because the freest from mere classicalism, the most Greek because pre-eminently and purely English'.³

The Greek writer whom Landor mentions as an influence on his own poetry is Pindar. Before writing *Gebir* he had read Pindar for the second time. 'What I admired was what nobody else had ever noticed—his proud complacency and scornful strength. If I could resemble him in nothing else, I was resolved to be as compendious and exclusive.'⁴ Elsewhere he praised Pindar's 'grandeur of soul, the rich economy' of his ideas and the temperate austerity of his judgment'.⁵ His other idol among the Greek poets was Aeschylus; his plays were 'nude as the heroes and gods and as well proportioned and potent'; in them was 'the loud clear challenge, the firm unstealthy step, of an erect broad-breasted soldier'.⁶ Of Euripides he had a low opinion, and of Plato an even lower. Although an admirer of 'proud complacency' might have been expected to find Plato congenial, he constantly pursues him with criticism. There is an elaborate attack on him in the Imaginary Conversation *Diogenes and Plato*, and further attacks elsewhere. The Imaginary Conversation, it may here be said, owed nothing to Plato. Lucian is a more likely model,

1 Forster, *Life and Works of Landor*, I, p. 15.

2 *Idem*, I, p. 13.

4 *Idem*, I, p. 49.

6 *Idem*, I, p. 377, cf. p. 500, II, p. 254.

3 *Idem*, I, p. 362.

5 *Idem*, IV, p. 97.

though the Landorian conversation bears little resemblance to any previous form of literature.

Ancient Greece provides the characters for a good number of the *Conversations*, including the lengthy *Pericles and Aspasia*, the record not of a conversation but of a correspondence. In the *Conversations* there is little of the historical novelist's attempt to recreate the figures of the past; Landor is more anxious to air his own opinions and prejudices than to be convincing or dramatic. In *Pericles and Aspasia*, however, he does succeed if not in creating characters, at any rate in depicting the age of Athenian greatness, and in catching something of the style and idiom of Attic life. He combines an appreciation of Greek art and architecture with an admiration for ancient republicanism. Landor's opinions are never merely conventional, and the old admiration for Greek liberty becomes with him something individual, keenly felt and vigorously expressed. Here is his list of the things which in his view flourish more among the free than under kings or tyrants: 'Independence of spirit, dignity of mind, rectitude of conduct, energy of character, truth of expression, and even lower and lighter things, eloquence, poetry, sculpture, painting.'¹ Pericles, the aristocratic leader of a democracy, was a congenial figure to Landor, as was Aeschylus, the sublime and difficult poet who was also the citizen and soldier of a free people.

¹ *Diogenes and Plato (Imaginary Conversations)* (ed. Crump), I, p. 106.

CHAPTER XIII

Archaeology and Travel in Greece, 1700-1800

‘Ausser der Brittischen besitzt keine der jetzigen Europäischen Nationen den Enthusiasmus für die Überbleibsel des Alterthums, der weder Kosten noch Mühe scheut, um sie, wo möglich, in ihren völligen Glanze wieder herzustellen.’

GOETHE

IN THE latter part of the eighteenth century there came about a second renaissance, the discovery of Greece. The first renaissance was rather the discovery of Rome, and of Greece as seen by Rome; it gave to Europe in architecture the dictates of Vitruvius, and in sculpture ‘the antique’, which meant in fact the mass-produced copies that had adorned the villas of the Roman rich. But in the period that extends roughly from 1750 to 1830 the labours of a number of scholars, travellers and collectors revealed something of the true nature of Greek art, and provided Europe with new models, the Doric of the Parthenon and the Ionic of the Erechtheum in place of the orders derived by the architects of the Italian Renaissance from Vitruvian precept and Roman practice, and the friezes and pediments of Phidias in place of the Apollo Belvedere, the Venus de’ Medici and the Laocoon.

In this work of discovery many countries of western Europe shared, as they shared in its fruits. But we may legitimately claim that England played the leading part. Englishmen were among the most active and resourceful of travellers in Greek lands, and were foremost in the acquisition of antiquities. In the accuracy and thoroughness of their scholarship English archaeologists compared favourably with those of other nations, while the books in which their researches were recorded are distinguished for their handsome appearance, and remain as the monuments of an age in which taste and scholarship were happily united.

The expedition to Greece of Stuart and Revett in the middle of the eighteenth century may be taken as the beginning of scientific archaeology. Before then the history of English archaeology is rather the history of collecting and of taste. Moreover, before Stuart

and Revett there was little awareness of Greece. It was rather to Rome that the collectors and the men of taste looked, Rome that was an almost inexhaustible storehouse of statues and other antiquities as well as being the seat of ancient buildings that had long captured the imagination of Europe.

The earliest and most famous collector of antiques in England was Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel (1586-1646), described by Horace Walpole as 'the father of vertu in England'.¹ He purchased freely in Rome, and also, though he did not visit Greece himself, acquired through his agent William Petty a number of genuine Greek remains, most famous of which was the chronological inscription known as *Marmor Parium*, which Petty obtained for him in Smyrna. Arranged round the gardens and galleries of Arundel House, the statues and inscriptions became one of the sights of London, and a source of great interest to the learned of the day, one of whom, John Selden, described a part of the collection in *Marmora Arundelliana* (1628). Later, after Arundel's death the collection was badly neglected, and in part dispersed.² A considerable part of it eventually found its way into the hands of Oxford University, and was described in two publications sponsored by the University, both with the title *Marmora Oxoniensia*, the first edited by Humphry Prideaux (1676), the second by Richard Chandler (1763).

There were other collectors who followed Lord Arundel, collectors of many types, from the rich peer who filled his country house with statues bought in Rome to the learned clergyman or physician with his 'cabinet of medals'. Coin collecting was a favourite pursuit of the age. One of the famous collections of the early eighteenth century, that of the physician Richard Mead, a friend of Bentley, was rich in coins and gems. So was that of another physician, Hans Sloane, which formed the nucleus of the British Museum. These early collectors seldom specialised. They delighted in curiosities of all sorts and all ages, the works of nature as well as of man. The virtuoso with

¹ For the history of collecting in England see Michaelis, *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain*.

² See Evelyn's *Diary*, Sept. 19, 1667. It was at his instance that the inscriptions were presented to Oxford. Of the statues some were acquired by the Earl of Pembroke, others by Lord Lempster, from whose son Lord Pomfret (who had them 'restored' by one Guelfi) they passed to the university.

his collection of miscellaneous curios was a recognised butt of the eighteenth-century humorists.

The study of antiquities was fostered by two societies founded in the eighteenth century, the Society of Antiquaries and the Society of Dilettanti. The former was incorporated in 1751, and its journal *Archaeologia* first appeared in 1779. But, though Greek coins and inscriptions occasionally formed the subject of papers communicated to the society, the antiquaries were not primarily concerned with classical antiquity, but far more with the history and archaeology of their own country. The society continued the tradition of English antiquarianism which went back to the Elizabethan age, when the first Society of Antiquaries was founded, a tradition which was none the less flourishing in the seventeenth century, though the society was in abeyance. Indeed, there was a more lively interest in such studies in the seventeenth than in the eighteenth century, when the antiquary was liable to be regarded with a certain scorn by the man of taste.

The Society of Dilettanti was pre-eminently the society for the man of taste. Its origin is described in the preface to Chandler's *Ionian Antiquities*: 'In the year 1734¹ some Gentlemen who had travelled in Italy, desirous of encouraging, *at home*, a Taste for those objects which had contributed so much to their entertainment *abroad*, formed themselves into a Society, under the name of the DILETTANTI, and agreed upon such Regulations as they thought necessary to keep up the Spirit of the Scheme.'² The members included a number of lords and not a few rakes. They had made the Grand Tour, and had come back from Italy with a taste for ancient art, and a collection of 'objects of virtù'; their meetings were gay and convivial. In the later eighteenth century the character of the society changed somewhat. Its pretensions increased; Dashwood and Sandwich were succeeded by Payne Knight, Hamilton and Townley, the gay amateurs by the learned and dictatorial arbiters of taste. Moreover, the society came to be particularly associated with research in Greek lands, and took the lead in the movement of taste from Rome

¹ In fact the first meeting took place in 1732. See Cust and Colvin, *History of the Society of Dilettanti*, p. 5.

² *Antiquities of Ionia*, preface.

towards Greece. It proved a valuable patron of serious research, and Greek archaeology in its early stages owed much to its support. In addition to other encouragement given to archaeology it assisted in the publication of Stuart and Revett's *Antiquities of Athens*, and financed two archaeological expeditions to Greece and Asia Minor, the results of which were published at the society's expense.

Among those who were active in Greek archaeology in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries we can perhaps distinguish three types. There were the residents, generally clergymen, men like Edmund Chishull, chaplain to the British factory at Smyrna, a student of inscriptions, or James Dallaway, chaplain at Constantinople and author of a book on the surrounding country and its antiquities.¹ In this class too come the ambassadors, Lord Elgin at Constantinople, directing from there his band of workmen on the Acropolis, or Sir William Hamilton collecting his vases at Naples. Then there were the young men on the Grand Tour, led to Greece by a love of antiquity or a desire for adventures off the beaten track; often they would be accompanied by an artist to perform the function that the camera performs for the modern traveller: Such were Lord Charlmont, who visited Greece in 1749 with Richard Dalton as his draughtsman; Sir Richard Worsley, who made a similar tour in 1785 accompanied by the artist Willey Reveley;² and J. B. S. Morritt, who toured Greece in 1795 with an unnamed and apparently not very accomplished³ Viennese draughtsman. Finally, there were the professionals, the scholars and architects, who excavated, measured, identified sites and studied topography, spending in some cases many years on their work.

Research in Greece was then by no means an easy matter. The archaeologist had to be hardy and resourceful. As the Dilettanti observed in their minutes regarding the second Ionian Mission, 'Pestilence may render the access to many places too dangerous to be attempted; insurrection, so common in the countries subject to

1 *Constantinople Ancient and Modern*, 1797.

2 Worsley formed a valuable collection which was described and illustrated in *Museum Worsleyanum*, 2 vols. 1798 and 1802.

3 To judge by the examples of his work published in *Letters of J. B. S. Morritt* (ed. G. E. Marindin, 1914).

the sway of the Porte, may completely shut up at once a great tract of country.’¹ This had been proved true by the experience of Stuart and Revett, who had to leave Athens prematurely owing to disorders in the city, and were driven hastily from Salonica by the plague. Asia Minor, with its community of English merchants at Smyrna, was more accessible than Greece proper. Athens was a small and squalid town, without inns or other amenities, governed by officials who were ignorant, obstructive and exacting.

Yet in spite of all discomforts and obstacles it was a golden age for the archaeologist. The degradation of Greece proved the opportunity for more advanced nations. Western Europe was enriched with the marbles of the Parthenon, of Aegina and of Phigalea. And even the ordinary traveller could pick up an inscription or a statue with the aid of a little persuasion and bribery. To give one small instance, J. B. S. Morritt, travelling round Greece in 1795, found a small statue half buried in the ground at Megara. In spite of its broken condition he thought it worth taking away. ‘At least,’ he writes in a letter, ‘it was not expensive; for, giving half a crown to a priest that belonged to a chapel near it, we pretended to have a firman, and carried it off from the Greeks in triumph.’²

English collectors seldom showed any regard for the sentiments of the people, which they treated often with an arrogance worthy of a Roman proconsul. ‘Inscriptions’, writes Robert Wood, ‘we copied as they fell in our way, and carried off the marbles wherever it was possible; for the avarice or superstition of the inhabitants made the task difficult and sometimes impracticable.’³ The colossal Cistophoros of Eleusis, formerly known as the Ceres, now in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, was regarded with superstitious reverence by the peasants, who clung to it with a tenacity which long resisted all attempts of Englishmen to carry it off. Eventually, however, it fell to E. D. Clarke, who thus describes his success: ‘I found the goddess in a dunghill, buried to her ears. The Eleusinian peasants, at the very mention of moving it, regarded me as one who would bring the moon from her orbit. What would become of their corn,

1 Quoted, Cust and Colvin, *op. cit.* p. 152.

2 *Letters of J. B. S. Morritt*, p. 182.

3 *Ruins of Palmyra*, pref.

they said, if the old lady with her basket was removed? I went to Athens and made application to the Pacha, aiding my request by letting an English telescope glide between his fingers. The business was done.'¹

The first English traveller to make an archaeological tour of Greek lands and leave a record of it in writing was Sir George Wheler. His visit was made in 1675-6 in the company of Jacob Spon, a physician, of Lyons. Each of the two wrote an account of the tour, Wheler's being published in 1682 with the title *A journey into Greece*. Spon and Wheler were for a long time the authorities on Greek antiquities, frequently quoted in footnotes, until the more accurate investigation of the later eighteenth century relegated their work to obscurity. James Stuart and Nicholas Revett were the real founders of Greek archaeology. Stuart was the son of a Scottish mariner, had worked, according to tradition, as a fan painter under Goupy in the Strand, and in 1742 made his way to Rome on foot to study architecture and art. Revett, who came of an old Suffolk family, arrived in Rome in the same year. Of the two Stuart had more pretensions as a scholar; he published in Rome a Latin treatise on a recently excavated obelisk of Augustus (1750), and it was he who was responsible for the letterpress in the *Antiquities of Athens*. In Italy the two had the idea of making an accurate study of the architecture of Greece, which at that time was very imperfectly known. As they observed in the proposals they drew up in 1748, 'Athens the mother of elegance and politeness, whose magnificence scarce yielded to that of Rome, and who for the beauties of a correct style must be allowed to surpass her, has been almost entirely neglected. So that unless exact copies of them shall be speedily made, all her beauteous Fabricks, her Temples, her Theatres, her Palaces, now in Ruins, will drop into oblivion.' They arrived at the Piraeus in March 1751, and left for Salonica and thence for Smyrna in 1753; when they arrived back in London it was nearly five years since they first set out from Rome. From the notes and drawings that they made four volumes were eventually published, though only the first was seen through the

¹ Otter, *Life of Clarke*, p. 505. According to Hobhouse the inhabitants of Eleusis showed no signs of regret at the loss of the Ceres, when he visited the place shortly afterwards. *Journey through Albania* (2nd ed.), I, p. 378.

press by Stuart himself.¹ In these famous volumes the ancient remains of Attica (with the addition of a few elsewhere) are carefully described, and illustrated with views, reconstructions and measured drawings of orders and of architectural details and sculptures. Stuart and Revett's work set a high standard of research to future archaeologists; while to architects and connoisseurs it revealed the hitherto unknown dignity and refinement of Greek architecture. Henceforth the Parthenon, the Erechtheum and the Monument of Lysicrates were as familiar to educated Englishmen as the Pantheon, the Colosseum and the Column of Trajan.

While they were at work in Athens, Stuart and Revett were met by two other Englishmen, Robert Wood and James Dawkins,² who had concluded an extensive tour of parts of Greece, Asia Minor, Syria, Phoenicia, Palestine and Egypt. This tour was partly if not mainly inspired by Wood's love of Homer, and his desire to read his works among the scenes he describes. His Homeric studies bore fruit in his *Essay on the Original Genius of Homer*, described already in an earlier chapter. But he had also equipped himself for archaeological work, taking with him as architectural draughtsman an Italian called Borra. He copied inscriptions, collected some marbles, and made a special study of the remains of Palmyra and Baalbec. On his return these were described in two volumes, *Ruins of Palmyra* (1753) and *Ruins of Baalbec* (1757). Wood's study of these two sites was not as thorough and scholarly as the researches of Stuart and Revett, nor, since the buildings he studied belong to the period of the Roman Empire, has he the same importance from our point of view. He was not in fact a great admirer of Greek architecture of the classical period. He contrasts the perfection of fifth-century sculpture with the contemporary Doric architecture, which he considers far short of perfection, 'and in many particulars against the rules of Vitruvius'.³ It is curious to find the admirer of the original genius of Homer

1 In 1762. The second volume appeared after his death in 1787, edited by William Newton, the third edited by Willey Reveley in 1794 and the fourth edited by Joseph Woods in 1814. A supplementary volume published in 1830 contained researches of Cockerell, Kinnaird, Donaldson, Jenkins and Railton.

2 A third member of the party, John Bouverie, died in the course of the tour and was buried at Smyrna.

3 Wood, *Ruins of Palmyra and Balbec* (ed. 1827), p. 16.

judging architecture by conventional academic standards which he rejected in literature.

The first 'Ionian Mission' of the Dilettanti Society set out for Asia Minor in 1764. It consisted of Richard Chandler, later a fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, Revett, who had already collaborated with Stuart as architectural draughtsman, and a young painter called Pars. They were instructed to make Smyrna their headquarters, and from there to visit the antiquities in the neighbourhood, making plans and drawings and copying inscriptions. The temples which they describe in *Ionian Antiquities* include those of Bacchus at Teos, of Minerva Polias at Priene, and of Apollo Didymaeus near Miletus. Their visits to other sites are described in Chandler's *Travels in Asia Minor* (1775), and a second volume, *Travels in Greece*, describes their visit to Athens, where they arrived after about a year in Asia Minor, and to other parts of Greece proper. The copying of inscriptions, which had been enjoined on the party, was dutifully pursued, and the texts with translation and notes were published by Chandler alone in his *Inscriptiones Antiquae* (1774).

Chandler's diaries of his travels though conscientious are flat and rather uninteresting. A later traveller wrote of him: 'He strikes me as a college fellow turned fresh out of Magdalen to a difficult and somewhat fatiguing voyage, for which he was as unfit as could be; and though very good at an inscription, was sure to go in the beaten track, and be bugbored by every story of danger and every Turk that pleased to take the trouble.'¹ Morritt, the author of this criticism, was more adventurous. He penetrated to regions of the Peloponnese reached by few earlier travellers,² and visited the remote temple of Apollo at Bassae. This Chandler had not seen; he had been content to give a brief description of it derived from a French architect Joachim Bocher, who had come across the ruins by chance in 1765 while travelling from Pyrgos to examine 'an ancient building near Caritena'.³ There were some grounds for the reluctance of travellers to penetrate to this remote spot. Bocher had made a second visit,

¹ Morritt, *Letters*, p. 191.

² See his *Account of a Journey through the District of Maina*, in Walpole's *Memoirs*, p. 33 f.

³ Chandler, *Travels in Greece*, ch. LXXVII.

and had never returned; it was believed that he had been murdered near the ruins of Bassae.¹

Morritt, like many other travellers, paid a visit to the Troad, and he took part in the lively controversy which flourished at the end of the century on the subject of the site of Troy.² At that time no Schliemann had revealed by excavation the remains of the Homeric city. The traveller was faced with a puzzling and ill-mapped landscape, to be reconciled with the uncertain evidence of Homer's own geographical hints, of ancient tradition, and of the remains of later Greek cities. The memory of the ancient city had survived in later antiquity in New Ilium, but the tradition was lost, and, when curiosity revived, some early travellers were led by the clearly visible ruins of the Hellenistic city Alexandria Troas, on the coast, to identify this with ancient Troy. George Sandys, however (the translator of Ovid), who journeyed there in 1610,³ seems to have preferred New Ilium, and Richard Pococke, who made an extensive tour of the East in the 1730's,⁴ was directed accurately to the hill of Hissarlik, where Schliemann was later to make his discoveries. Wood when he visited the Troad, Homer in hand, in 1750, was unable to reach any definite conclusion. He was worried, as Strabo had been in antiquity and other investigators have been since, by the Homeric passage which describes Troy as lying by the springs of Scamander, one of which was warm; Wood found a warm spring, but it was in a marshy plain, far from the true source of the river, which he followed up to the hills. He was forced to conclude that the ground had greatly changed since Homer's time.

A new theory, which was plausible enough to hold the field for many years, resulted from the researches of Count Choiseul-Gouffier, ambassador at Constantinople, who was the first to make a careful investigation of the Troad. The theory is generally associated with his fellow-worker J.-B. le Chevalier, who took all the credit for it, communicating it, without any acknowledgement of his indebtedness

1 See *Antiquities of Athens*, Suppl. vol. (1830), section III, quoting Pouqueville, *Voyage en Morée*, 1798.

2 See Finsler, *Homer in der Neuzeit*, p. 256 f.

3 Sandys, *Relation of a Journey*, 1615.

4 Pococke, *A Description of the East*, 1743-5.

to Choiseul-Gouffier, to the Royal Society of Edinburgh. His *Description of the Plain of Troy* was published, in a translation by Andrew Dalzel, in 1791. The new theory was briefly that the Homeric Troy was not on the coast, nor at New Ilium, but farther inland, on the very edge of the plain, above the village of Bunarbashi. It was supported, among other arguments, by the alleged discovery near Bunarbashi of two springs, one hot and one cold, which were identified with the source of the Scamander described by Homer. Later investigators found from thirty to forty springs, all of the same temperature. The theory involved identifying the Scamander with the brook that rises from these springs and soon loses itself in marshy swamps, and giving the name of Simois to the large river that has every claim to be regarded as the Scamander, the river that Wood had followed up to its source in the hills.

Le Chevalier's treatise produced an answer from Jacob Bryant,¹ who had never visited Troy himself, and could only argue from books. He pointed out that le Chevalier made the city too far inland to fit in with the Homeric evidence. But he came to the conclusion, as has already been related in an earlier chapter, that there were so many contradictions and impossibilities in the Homeric story that it could not be historical; that the Trojan War never took place, and that there was no city of Troy, at any rate in that part of the world.² Bryant was answered in a hasty pamphlet by Gilbert Wakefield,³ and more systematically by Morritt, in his *Vindication of Homer*.⁴ In the first part of his work Morritt criticises Bryant's sceptical theories about the existence of Troy; in the second he turns to topography and adds his support to Chevalier, whose book had been his guide when he visited the Troad.⁵ The indefatigable Bryant was not slow to reply, first to Morritt himself, secondly to a writer in the *British Critic* who had supported Morritt.⁶

It is unnecessary to dwell on these tedious and pedantic productions,

1 *Observations upon a treatise... by M. le Chevalier*, 1795.

2 *A Dissertation...* etc., 1796.

3 *A letter to Jacob Bryant Esq....*, 1797.

4 1798.

5 James Dallaway (*Constantinople Ancient and Modern*, 1797) also agrees with Chevalier.

6 *Some Observations...*, 1799. *An expostulation addressed to the British Critick*, 1799.

nor on Morritt's final reply.¹ They added nothing to the elucidation of the problem, which could hardly be solved, so far as it is soluble, except by excavation. Until Schliemann in the 1870's began to work on the hill of Hissarlik, the theory of le Chevalier held the field. It was supported not only by Morritt, but by William Franklin,² and by those eminent travellers Gell and Leake. There were, however, some dissentients. E. D. Clarke thought he had found the site of Troy at the village of Chiblak, a short distance to the east of Hissarlik, while J. Rennell preferred the height of Aksni Kioi which overlooks the right bank of the Scamander opposite to the heights of Bali Dagħ, on which stands Bunarbashi.³ C. Maclaren seems to have been alone (among Englishmen) in identifying Troy with Novum Ilium.⁴

At the end of the eighteenth century there flourished a number of Englishmen who were known as discriminating collectors and connoisseurs of ancient art, men of means and leisure, familiar with Rome and other European capitals, who formed a circle which centred in the Dilettanti Society, and had little contact with the universities or with classical scholarship in the ordinary sense of the words. Among these collectors a few deserve special mention.

Charles Townley was, like several other collectors, a Roman Catholic, and being thus by his religion excluded from public life devoted himself entirely to connoisseurship. He lived at Rome for a number of years, and was active in buying antiquities and promoting excavation. He wrote little, but enjoyed a considerable reputation, and his London house was a meeting place for those of similar tastes. The statues and other works of art that had adorned his rooms were bought after his death for the British Museum. A younger contemporary, Thomas Hope, had, like Townley, travelled extensively, and like him was the owner of a notable collection. By contrast with Townley he belongs to the new age which had discovered Greece. He was a protagonist of the pure Greek style in architecture, and wielded a certain amount of influence in the early

1 *Additional Remarks on the Topography of Troy*, 1800.

2 *Remarks and Observations on the Plain of Troy*, 1800.

3 *Observations on the Topography of the Plain of Troy*, 1814.

4 *Dissertation on . . . the Plain of Troy*, 1822. See Schliemann, *Ilios*, p. 184 f.

nineteenth century in promoting the Grecian taste. He was also the author of a work on the costume of the ancients, and of a novel called *Anastasius, or Memoirs of a Greek* (1819). This was attributed to Byron, who, so it is said, wept at not having in fact written it.

Sir William Hamilton, well known as ambassador at Naples and husband of the famous Emma, was also a zealous collector, and one who did not, like many of his contemporaries, interest himself primarily in marbles, but devoted himself to the collection of Greek vases. He was the first, and almost the only Englishman to study vase painting, which, in comparison with other ancient arts of equal interest, was at that time little known and appreciated. During his long residence in Naples, where his house formed a centre for antiquarians and connoisseurs English and foreign, he formed a considerable collection. He began in 1766 with the purchase of an existing collection of vases, terracottas, bronzes, coins and other minor antiquities. After this had been sold in 1772 to the British Museum he began once more to acquire vases, mainly from the finds in Sicily and the neighbourhood of Naples. His second collection was in part lost at sea on the way to England; but the major part reached home safely and was purchased by Thomas Hope, to adorn his country house of Deepdene in Surrey.

In 1766-7 Hamilton published at his own expense four volumes describing his collection as it then was, the volumes being published at Naples under the title *Antiquités Etrusques Grecques et Romaines*, with text in French and English. His second collection was published by W. Tischbein, again with French and English texts, at Naples in 1791. These two publications were not easily accessible to the general public in England, and there was no discovery of Greek vases comparable to that of Greek architecture.¹ Yet Hamilton's collections had some influence on English art. As the proofs of the plates for *Antiquités Etrusques Grecques et Romaines* were struck off he distributed them to his friends. Among the recipients was Lord Cathcart, who handed them on to Wedgwood the potter. The engravings

¹ A selection of designs from Hamilton's publications was published in England by a Mr Kirk. *Outlines from the Figures and Compositions upon the Greek Roman and Etruscan Vases of the late Sir William Hamilton*, 2nd ed. 1814.

inspired him with new ideas for designs on the ancient model, while the account in the text of ancient methods of vase painting set him to work on experiments for the revival of the old technique. Wedgwood's imitations of the antique quickly became popular, and the name of 'Etruria' borne by the works in Staffordshire still testifies to the influence that 'Etruscan' vases, as they were then generally called, exercised over Wedgwood. Greek vase painting also influenced the art of Flaxman. Its inspiration is clearly seen in his outline illustrations of Homer, and can be seen also in those graceful but rather insipid reliefs in which Greek calm and simplicity were united with the tender sentiment of evangelical Christianity.

The most distinguished among the Dilettanti was Richard Payne Knight, a man of diverse learning and real ability, who besides being a collector and an authority on antiques wrote also on philology and aesthetics, and, as we have seen in an earlier chapter, was responsible for an able though perverse edition of Homer.

At an age when others were at school or at the university he was travelling in Italy. Somewhat later, in 1777, he toured Sicily, and kept a diary, which was translated by Goethe as *Tagebuch einer Reise nach Sicilien*. 'This was the second time', write the historians of the Dilettanti Society, 'that a treatise by an individual member of the Dilettanti had the good fortune to act upon the general mind and culture of Europe, producing effects out of proportion to any critical or scientific value of its own. First the *Polymetis* of Spence,¹ the elegant composition of an old-fashioned scholar on whom a sense of the true methods of archaeological study had not yet dawned, provoked from Lessing the chief part of the arguments in his immortal *Laocoon*; and now the travelling diary of Payne Knight helped to awaken and stimulate in Goethe that deep and luminous appreciation of classical art which became so large a part of his intellectual endowment.'²

In his own country Payne Knight was a considerable figure, though not one who left any permanent mark on taste and opinion. He was 'the arbiter of fashionable virtue', a great authority on questions of art and scholarship, but not one whose influence reached

1 Joseph Spence, 1699-1768. His *Polymetis* appeared in 1747.

2 Cust and Colvin, *op. cit.* p. 119.

much beyond a comparatively small circle. By his obstinate refusal to see any merit in the Elgin marbles he set himself against the artists of his own day and the general verdict of posterity. He was influenced perhaps by an unconscious feeling that these new discoveries threatened the aristocratic standards of the Dilettanti and made their much-prized collections of little value. Knight himself as a collector did not specialise in sculpture; his collection, which was bequeathed to the British Museum on his death, was particularly strong in bronzes, coins and gems, and it was on these smaller antiquities that he could speak with most authority. A noteworthy feature of his *Dissertation on Greek sculpture*, prefixed to the first volume of the Dilettanti's *Specimens of Antient Sculpture*, is the use he makes of the evidence of coins to fill the gaps caused by the lack of other material.

It may be asked what attempts were made to digest the new discoveries of the eighteenth century, to form a general picture of the history of ancient art and of the methods and aims of archaeology. As far as this country is concerned little attempt was made. There was no English Winckelmann. A translation from Winckelmann by Fuseli appeared in 1765 under the title *Reflections on the Painting and Sculpture of the Greeks*, but the German hellenist seems to have had little influence in this country, and even his translator decries him as one who 'reasoned himself into frigid reveries and Platonic dreams on beauty'.¹ But a considerable influence, at any rate in a limited circle, was exercised by another foreigner, Pierre François Hugues, generally known as d'Hancarville.² He appeared at Naples in 1763 and won the patronage and friendship of Hamilton. Endowed with an extensive though unbalanced learning and a loudly expressed enthusiasm for art, this semi-impostor, a Winckelmann without the German's genuine insight, became the theorist and interpreter of ancient art for the dilettanti of Hamilton's circle. He was responsible for the descriptive commentary on the vases of Hamilton's first collection, in *Antiquités Etrusques Grecques et Romaines*. In 1784 he came to London to visit Townley, and in his house completed his formidable work *Recherches sur l'Origine l'Esprit et le Progrès des Arts de la Grèce*, published in London in 1785, a work which is

1 Fuseli, *Lectures (Life and Writings of Fuseli)*, by J. Knowles, 1831, II, p. 14).

2 See Justi, *Winckelmann*, II, ii, p. 381.

described by Michaelis as 'a fantastic farrago of mystico-symbolical revelations and groundless hypotheses'.¹ It was under d'Hancarville's influence that there was published in 1786 an account by Hamilton of a survival of phallic worship at a small town in southern Italy, with a *Discourse on the Worship of Priapus and its connexion with the Mystic Theology of the Ancients* by Payne Knight, a work which so offended contemporaries that Knight called in all the copies he could, with the result that it now has at any rate the distinction of extreme rarity. As a result of d'Hancarville's theorising writers on ancient art towards the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth tend to become involved in speculations on symbolism and mythology which are likely to be read with little patience to-day.²

In 1799 the Dilettanti decided to publish *Select Specimens of Antient Sculpture preserved in the several Collections of Great Britain*, a project in which Townley and Knight were the prime movers. The first volume appeared in 1808, and the second after many delays in 1824. The specimens are mainly taken from the collections of Knight and Townley, though those of the Marquess of Lansdowne, the Earl of Egremont, and Thomas Hope were also represented. The volumes are truly aristocratic in style and execution, and form the final monument of eighteenth-century dilettantism. With the coming of the new century comes not the end, but at least the decline of private collecting and the growth of public collections. There came also new discoveries in Greek art which dethroned the old idols and discredited many of those marbles which had been brought back from Rome to English country houses. A new chapter in the history of the discovery of Greek art opens with the bringing to England of the Elgin

1 *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain*, p. 99.

2 The study of Greek vases in particular suffered from the belief that they 'were originally intended for use in the mystic ceremonies of Ceres and Bacchus; that the subjects represented on them related to such ceremonies; and that they were placed in tombs as symbols that the deceased had been initiated' (Millingen, *Ancient Unedited Monuments*, I, p. iv). Millingen, writing in 1822, maintains that 'the vases, the origin of which is supposed to be so mysterious, are no others than the common pottery intended for the various purposes of ordinary life, and for ornament, like the China and Staffordshire ware of the present day' (*op. cit.* I, p. vi).

marbles, before which Haydon exclaimed: 'This is the beauty of form; this is the just blending of truth and refinement that you look for in vain in the hard marbly puffed figure of the Apollo, the muzzy Antinous, or the myriad fragments of the antique which have inundated Europe for the last three hundred years.'¹

1 Haydon, *Autobiography and Memoirs* (ed. 1926), I, p. 144.

CHAPTER XIV

Archaeology and Travel in Greece, 1800-1830

'It is this union of nature with ideal beauty... that ranks at once the Elgin marbles above all other works of art in the world.' B. R. HAYDON

ALL PREVIOUS archaeological expeditions to Greece were eclipsed by that of the Earl of Elgin, who was appointed Ambassador to Constantinople in 1799, and made his term of office famous by the acquisition of the most valuable of the remains of ancient Athens.¹ The lavishness with which he equipped himself and the extent of his acquisitions recall the proconsuls of Republican Rome. But like Mummius, an earlier despoiler of Greece, he could say that his activities were on behalf of the state not himself. From first to last his desire was to benefit his country; and from the controversies that surround his mission he himself emerges as honourable and disinterested, and according to the standards of his day, a zealous promoter of the arts.

The suggestion that the mission should be used for archaeological research came in the first instance from the architect Thomas Harrison, who had built a house for Elgin in Scotland, and who shared the interest in Greek art that had been aroused by the work of Stuart and Revett and the Dilettanti. He pointed out how valuable it would be if not only measured drawings but also casts were available in England. Elgin attempted to interest the government in the idea, but as often happens where the arts are concerned, the government's reply was negative. Undeterred he decided to have the work done at his own expense, and having failed to secure the services of Turner, he collected a band of artists abroad. His main assistant was a topographical artist called Lusieri; under him were a draughtsman, two architects and two *formatori* or moulders, to make casts of the sculptures. A number of musicians completed the ambassador's suite.

¹ See *Report of Select Committee on the Earl of Elgin's Collection*, 1816; *Memorandum on the Earl of Elgin's Pursuits in Greece*, by W. R. Hamilton; *Autobiography and Memoirs of B. R. Haydon*; A. H. Smith in *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (1916), xxxvi, p. 163 f.

In the autumn of 1800 the band of artists started work, measuring, drawing, moulding. At first Elgin's intention was only to make drawings and casts, not to take away any of the sculpture, but as he learnt more of conditions in Athens and saw the constant destruction and defacement to which the antiquities were subject, he changed his plan, and determined to remove as much of the sculpture as he could.¹ In the summer of 1801 he obtained from the Porte a firman which not only gave freedom for his artists to go about the work of drawing modelling and excavating, but also permission to take away 'any pieces of stone with inscriptions or figures'. Dr Hunt, Elgin's chaplain, who was actively interested in the archaeological work, was despatched to Athens with the firman to see that the instructions were carried out. At once all obstacles were removed. The men set to work clearing the Caryatid porch of the Erechtheum, and Hunt even wrote to Elgin, 'If your Lordship would come here in a large Man of War, that beautiful little model of ancient art might be transported wholly to England.'² Soon they were at work on the Parthenon, and had begun taking down the metopes.

The work progressed rapidly, and much had been accomplished when in the spring of 1802 Elgin himself went to Greece to see the progress of the work at Athens, and to visit other sites in search of antiquities. It should not be imagined that because he had not been able to visit the scene of operations he regarded the work with lordly aloofness and left it entirely to his agents. He took a lively interest in the study and collecting of antiquities; he made suggestions in letters to Lusieri for new activities, proposing for example the excavation of Olympia. 'It is one of the most interesting and curious pieces of work—a place that has never been touched... You would be the first, and history assures us that there are statues, riches, monu-

1 'From the period of Stuart's visit to Athens till the period I went to Turkey, a very great destruction had taken place... Every traveller coming added to the general defacement of the statuary in his reach... And the Turks have been continually defacing the heads; and in some instances they have actually acknowledged to me that they have pounded down the statues to convert them into mortar. It was upon these suggestions and with these feelings that I proceeded to remove as much of the sculpture as I conveniently could; it was no part of my original plan to bring away anything but my models' (*Report of Select Committee*, pp. 40-41).

2 *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xxxvi, p. 196.

ments of all sorts in such abundance that this dig is deserving of every effort that can be made there.¹ This project came to nothing, and it was in Athens that most of Elgin's work was done. There he considered the most perfect models were to be found, and it was his aim to possess an example of everything that there was to be seen, specimens of the various columns, cornices, friezes and ornaments, and indeed any antiquities that could be obtained. There was no limit to his desires. He was emphatic in urging excavation, and many fragments were unearthed on the Acropolis and added to his collection. His excavations, the first to be undertaken in Greece, were made simply in order to discover buried objects of art; he and his workmen were innocent of any desire to carry out excavation in the modern sense, for the purpose of investigating the historical development of a site.

Early in 1803 Elgin left the East, and his company of artists was disbanded. Lusieri, however, stayed on and continued with the work of collecting, and it was some years before his task was completed. The first case of antiquities arrived in England in 1802, and it was not until 1825 that the final batch of Lusieri's drawings was sent off. There were difficulties of transport into which it is unnecessary to enter here. One ship containing cases of Parthenon marbles was wrecked off Cerigo on the way to Malta, but all the cases were eventually recovered and found their way to England. The collection when complete included the great majority of the sculptures from the Parthenon, the pediments, the metopes and the frieze; four reliefs from the temple of Nike on the Acropolis; architectural specimens from the Parthenon and the Propylaea; one of the Caryatids from the Erechtheum, and capitals, pieces of cornice and other details from the same temple; and a large number of miscellaneous statues, reliefs, inscriptions and other antiquities.

In May 1803 as Elgin was passing through Paris on his way home he was arrested under Napoleon's decree which made all adult Englishmen prisoners of war. After three years he was released and returned to his country. A large part of his collection had already arrived before him, but the cases remained unpacked, stored in private houses, and the country in general knew nothing of the

1 *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XXXVI, p. 207.

treasures they contained. When in 1807 the marbles were first displayed in a room at the back of Elgin's house in Park Lane it was only gradually that their exceptional interest and value came to be recognised.

The Society of Dilettanti, which might have been expected to take an active and intelligent interest in the work of a great collector who had done so much to further the knowledge of Greek art, remained uninterested and indeed hostile to Elgin and the Parthenon marbles. As early as 1803 Charles Townley had communicated to the society a letter from Elgin, believing apparently that the Dilettanti would be ready to add their support to Elgin's undertakings; but in fact nothing was done.¹ So far from supporting Elgin, the Dilettanti became identified with the critical opposition which endeavoured to depreciate the marbles and long delayed their recognition. This was mainly due to the attitude of the arch-dilettante, the dictator of England in matters of taste and archaeology, Payne Knight. Without seeing them, he revived the old theory of Spon and Wheler that the Parthenon sculptures were of the time of Hadrian. 'You have lost your labour, my lord Elgin,' he said at a dinner party; 'your marbles are overrated; they are not Greek, they are Roman of the time of Hadrian.'² Again, in the preliminary essay to his *Specimens of Antient Sculpture*, he speaks coolly of the marbles as 'merely architectural sculptures, executed from Phidias's designs and under his directions, probably by workmen scarcely ranked among artists'.³

While the men of taste remained critical and aloof, the artists began to discover the Elgin marbles and to proclaim their merits. Benjamin West and Fuseli were among their admirers, but the most fervent and persistent champion was the unhappy B. R. Haydon. In 1808 Wilkie suggested to him a visit to the marbles. They went to Park Lane, passed through the hall into a yard, and thence to a 'damp, dirty penthouse'. Here at the first sight of the sculptures Haydon found something he had been groping after and looking for clearly displayed, what he called the 'combination of nature and idea', 'the most heroic style of art combined with all the essential detail of actual life'.

1 See Cust and Colvin, *op. cit.* pp. 130 f.

2 Haydon, *Autobiography and Memoirs* (1926), I, p. 207.

3 P. xxxix.

'I felt the future, I foretold that they would prove themselves the finest things on earth, that they would overthrow the false beau-ideal, where nature was nothing, and would establish the true beau-ideal, of which nature alone is the basis. I shall never forget the horses' heads, the feet in the metopes! I felt as if a divine truth had blazed inwardly on my mind, and I knew they would at last rouse the art of Europe from its slumber in the darkness.... I passed the evening in a mixture of torture and hope; all night I dozed and dreamed of the marbles. I rose at five in a fever of excitement, tried to sketch the Theseus from memory, did so, and saw that I had comprehended it. I worked that day, and another, and another, fearing that I was deluded. At last I got an order for myself; I rushed away to Park Lane; the impression was more vivid than before. I drove off to Fuseli, and fired him to such a degree that he ran upstairs, put on his coat and away we sallied.... At last we came to Park Lane. Never shall I forget his uncompromising enthusiasm. He strode about saying, "De Greeks were Godes! De Greeks were Godes!"'¹

In 1811 negotiations were begun for the sale of the collection to the government. Elgin suggested a sum of rather over £60,000, representing the expenses incurred in making the collection, with interest added. The Prime Minister, Spencer Perceval, was willing to recommend Parliament to pay £30,000 but no more. Elgin, offended by this unsympathetic response, declined the terms, and there the matter rested for a time.

Meanwhile appreciation of the marbles slowly spread.² Haydon was indefatigable in expounding their beauties, and though England might ignore her own prophets, she could hardly remain deaf to the voices of foreign connoisseurs. Prince Ludwig of Bavaria, who visited London in 1814, expressed his admiration of the marbles, and in the same year Visconti, director of the Musée Napoléon, and the

1 Haydon, *Autobiography and Memoirs*, I, pp. 67, 68.

2 Their popularity is curiously illustrated by an advertisement in *The Times* of 1814. 'To the Nobility, Gentry and Fashionable World—Ross's newly invented GRECIAN VOLUTE HEADRESS, formed from the true marble models, brought into this country from the Acropolis of Athens by Lord Elgin, rivals any other hitherto invented. The elegance of taste and simplicity of nature which it displays, together with the facility of dressing, have caused its universal admiration and adoption' (quoted *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xxxvi, p. 317).

leading European authority on classical sculpture, having been invited to London by Elgin to give an appreciation of the collection, recorded a highly favourable verdict.¹ Moreover, in November 1815, Canova, whose authority none could dispute, visited England, and was full of admiration for the marbles. 'Oh that I had but to begin again!' he exclaimed on his first visit, 'to unlearn all that I have learned—I now at last see what ought to form the real school of sculpture.'² 'I think', he wrote to Elgin, 'that I can never see them often enough; and although my stay in this great capital must be extremely short, I dedicate every moment that I can spare to the contemplation of these celebrated remains of antient art. I admire in them the truth of nature united to the choice of the finest forms.'³ The Phigalean marbles had recently come to England, bought by the Prince Regent. The Dilettanti, led by Payne Knight, preferred them to the Parthenon sculptures. Canova considered them good, but nothing to the Elgin marbles; if the former, he said, were worth £15,000, the latter were worth £100,000.

After these impressive testimonies the government was at last prepared to take action. In February 1816 in reply to a petition by Elgin to the House of Commons, a Select Committee was appointed to enquire whether the collection should be purchased on behalf of the public, and, if so, at what price. After hearing Elgin himself the committee called on the most eminent sculptors of the day. Nollekens, uncouth and inarticulate, said that the sculptures were 'very fine; the finest things that ever came to this country'. Flaxman and Westmacott were better able to expatiate on their merits. Haydon was not called before the committee, and took his revenge for this neglect in a vigorous article in the press 'On the judgment of connoisseurs being preferred to that of professional men'. The article is directed against Payne Knight, who persisted in his perverse depreciation of the marbles. 'I should put them in the second rank',

1 *Lettre de E. A. Visconti à un Anglais*, 1814. Printed in *Memorandum on the Earl of Elgin's Pursuits*, App. II.

2 *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xxxvi, p. 333. Elgin had met Canova in Rome on the way back from Greece and had consulted him on the question of restoration of the sculptures. Canova was emphatic in advising against restoration (*idem*, p. 255). Flaxman was of the same opinion (*idem*, pp. 297, 298).

3 *Report of Select Committee*, p. xxiii.

he told the committee. Wilkins the architect was not enthusiastic, and must be reckoned among the detractors.¹ Others of the Dilettanti, however, Aberdeen and Morritt, did not support Payne Knight and added their testimony as to the importance of the marbles.

The end of the matter was that the collection was bought for £35,000, which was less than half of Elgin's final estimate of his expenditure, and was exhibited in the British Museum. The sum might be inadequate, but the nation through Parliament had now set the seal of approval on the work that Elgin had carried on alone and without encouragement. The committee ended its report with these words: 'If it be true, as we learn from history and experience, that free governments afford a soil most suitable to the production of native talent, to the maturing of the powers of the human mind and to the growth of every species of excellence, by opening to merit the prospect of reward and distinction, no country can be better adapted than our own to afford an honourable asylum to these monuments of the school of Phidias and of the administration of Pericles; where secure from further injury and degradation, they may receive that admiration and homage to which they are entitled, and serve in return as models and examples to those who by knowing how to revere and appreciate them may learn first to imitate and ultimately to rival them.'

Such was the official verdict of the age, and no doubt most people in England shared these sentiments. Later ages have felt some doubt about the claims of our country to be the most suitable home for the Parthenon sculptures. Sentimental and aesthetic considerations have seemed to some stronger than the similarity of Periclean and English democracy. Nor did a new school of sculpture blossom forth in nineteenth-century London to rival the glories of fifth-century Athens. In one respect, however, the sentiments of the Select Committee can hardly be impugned. There is no doubt that the marbles in Athens were badly neglected and were rapidly falling into decay. The Turkish authorities cared nothing for them; the Greeks were powerless, and felt towards the marbles little more than an inarticulate and uninformed affection bordering on superstition. It would never

¹ In *Atheniensia* (p. 120) he quotes Knight with approval: 'Supported by such authority we may venture to check that mistaken enthusiasm which venerates the sculptures as the work of Phidias.'

have occurred to Elgin that Greece would recover her independence and self-respect, and with it her consciousness of and pride in the past. 'I have said nothing', wrote Hobhouse in 1810, 'of the possibility of the ruins of Athens being, in the event of a revolution in the favour of the Greeks, restored and put into a condition capable of resisting the ravages of decay; for an event of that nature cannot, it strikes me, have even entered the head of anyone who has seen Athens and the modern Athenians.'¹

Nevertheless, criticism of Elgin is not merely a recent development, the result of modern sentimentality and Greek national feeling. Dodwell, who was at Athens in 1801 when the Parthenon was being despoiled, asserts that 'the Athenians in general, nay even the Turks themselves, did lament the ruin that was committed'.² Hobhouse, who was there only a few years after Elgin left, records that a lively controversy was raging among the foreigners in Greece on the subject of Elgin and his works, and that he had found inscribed on the Erechtheum the words, 'Quod non fecerunt Goti, Hoc fecerunt Scoti'.³ The English travellers of the period generally express some degree of criticism. 'All who visit Athens will abhor Lord Elgin', wrote Basevi.⁴ Clarke, though jubilant at his own scoop in capturing the Ceres of Eleusis under the very nose of Elgin, deplores the ambassador's activities on the Acropolis.⁵ Dodwell writes indignantly of the 'insensate barbarism' of Elgin, and of his 'devastating outrage which will never cease to be deplored'.⁶ But the most powerful indictment came from Byron. In the *Curse of Minerva* (1812) he brands Elgin as vandal, and the goddess of the Parthenon is made to curse the despoiler of her temple.⁷ Byron's generous

1 *Journey through Albania* (2nd ed.), I, p. 347.

2 *Classical and Topographical Tour*, I, p. 323. 3 *Op. cit.* I, pp. 292, 345.

4 (1819) quoted Bolton, *Portrait of Sir John Soane*, p. 277.

5 Clarke, *Travels*, VI, p. 225; Otter, *Life of Clarke*, p. 502. Cf. Hughes, *Travels* (ed. 1830), I, p. 265; Wilkins, *Atheniensia*, p. 144.

6 *Tour*, I, pp. 324, 322.

7 Cf. also *Childe Harold*, Canto II, xi f. Byron combined a low opinion of the marbles with a sentimental indignation at their removal:

Let Aberdeen and Elgin still pursue
The shades of fame through regions of virtù;
Waste useless thousands on their Phidian freaks
Misshapen monuments and maimed antiques.

English Bards and Scotch Reviewers. I. 1027.

wrath has strongly influenced posterity, and since his day most Englishmen outside the British Museum have felt slightly uneasy that the marbles should be in Bloomsbury and not on the Acropolis.

The number of English travellers who found their way to Greece in the early nineteenth century was considerable. According to Hobhouse, whereas a visit to Greece was formerly a considerable undertaking, 'Attica at present swarms with travellers, and several of our fair countrywomen have ascended the rocks of the Acropolis'.¹ Of these travellers some came out of curiosity, some for architectural study and archaeological research; some were interested in topography and some in picturesque beauty; some brought home with them a collection of antiques, some a portfolio of drawings and notes for a book of travels. The travellers of this period had wider interests than those of the previous century; they did not confine themselves to antiquarian interests, but were alive to the charms of scenery and the varieties of manners that they found. They observed flora and fauna, customs and costumes, as well as temples and inscriptions.

In 1801 the versatile and energetic Cambridge don E. D. Clarke arrived at Athens. He was bear-leading a young man called Cripps, on a very grand tour, which took the two via Scandinavia to Russia, and thence through Asia Minor to Palestine and Egypt, and so to Greece. Clarke came full of energy and enthusiasm, with a considerable collection of manuscripts, and a growing collection of antiques which he destined for his university. His acquisition of the Ceres of Eleusis has already been mentioned.² Another acquisition on which he prided himself was the 'Tomb of Euclid', a stele which he found in Athens, bearing the inscription ΕΥΚΛΙΔΑΣ ΕΥΚΛΙΔΟΥ ΕΡΜΙΟΝΕΥΣ. 'How interesting', he writes, 'such an antiquity must be for the University of Cambridge, where the name of Euclid is so particularly revered.'³ Unfortunately, the Euclid referred to bore no relation to the mathematician so much revered by the University. In 1802 Clarke returned with his manuscripts and his antiques to an admiring Cambridge. The Ceres was placed in the

¹ *Journey*, I, p. 302. Travel in Greece was however still far from comfortable. Inns were still unknown, though according to Hobhouse, one was shortly to be provided to house the increasing number of visitors.

² See p. 179. See also Clarke, *Travels*, VI, pp. 600 f.

³ Otter, *Life of Clarke*, p. 507.

University Library (with an inscription by Porson), and the whole collection was described by Clarke in a volume published at the expense of the University.¹ The work is considered of little archaeological value. Clarke's scholarship was somewhat superficial; archaeology was only one among a number of interests, and soon he was appearing in the role not of traveller and collector but of popular lecturer on mineralogy.

Many books were written in this period describing tours in Greece. It is unnecessary here to mention them all, or to go into details about the travellers' movements and activities. Hobhouse's *Journey through Albania* describes the tour made by the author in the company of Byron. The most famous of visitors to Greece was the least archaeological in his tastes, and his companion Hobhouse, though he discourses at length on the Troad, is not primarily interested in antiquity and its remains. Edward Dodwell (a descendant of the chronologer), who toured Greece in 1801, 1805 and 1806 and wrote *A Classical and Topographical Tour* (1819), was an observant and enterprising traveller, interested in the present as well as the past, and not without skill as an artist. While in traditional fashion he took with him a professional, Signor Pomardi of Rome, he himself was scarcely less busy with his pencil, and he returned with four hundred of his own drawings as well as six hundred of Pomardi's. Some of these sketches appear as illustrations to his *Tour*, others in his *Views and Descriptions of Cyclopian or Pelasgic Remains*.

Two very active travellers and prolific writers were Gell and Leake, who covered almost every corner of Greece, and performed useful work as topographers in describing the country and identifying sites. Sir William Gell's earliest activities were in the Troad, which he toured in 1801 and described a few years later. According to Byron, he 'topographised and typographised King Priam's dominions in three days'. In 1804 he was touring the Peloponnese, and in 1806 he was with Dodwell in Ithaca. A series of books by him covered a large part of the country: *Geography and Antiquities of Ithaca* (1807), *Itinerary of Greece* (1810), *Itinerary of the Morea* (1817), *Narrative of a Journey in the Morea* (1823). W. M. Leake, a colonel in the artillery, in the course of his military duties acquired a re-

¹ *Greek marbles brought from the shores of the Euxine, Archipelago and Mediterranean*, 1809.

markable knowledge of Greece and the eastern Mediterranean, and left a number of useful topographical books. His travels began in 1799 when he was sent out on a mission to instruct the Turks in artillery; his experiences were described in a *Journal of a Tour in Asia Minor* (1824). From 1802 to 1810 he was almost continuously in Greece, making a geographical survey for his government, and on other official business. He was a careful, accurate observer, and his interest in ancient Greece made his books of value to the classical scholar as well as to the military. His publications were: *Topography of Athens* (1821), *Journal of a Tour in Asia Minor* (1824), *Travels in the Morea* (1830), *Travels in Northern Greece* (1835), *Peloponnesiaca* (1846), and *On some disputed questions of Ancient Geography* (1857). In the course of his travels he acquired a fair number of antiques. His sculptures he presented to the British Museum, while his coins, vases and bronzes were bought by Cambridge University after his death.

Distinguished from the travellers and topographers are the archaeologists—or the architects, for the two are almost synonymous; those who seriously studied the buildings of ancient Greece were in most cases those who afterwards practised as architects at home, and at this period a few years' study in Greece was as normal a preparation for an architect's career as was a visit to Italy in the mid-eighteenth century and a sketching tour of France in the mid-nineteenth.

William Wilkins went from Cambridge in 1801 to spend three years studying in Greece, Asia Minor, Italy and Sicily. The results of his researches are to be found in his *Antiquities of Magna Graecia* (1807), in which, after an introduction on temple architecture in general, he described and illustrated the antiquities of Syracuse, Agrigentum, Selinus, Segesta and Paestum, and in *Atheniensiæ*, or *Remarks on the Topography and Buildings of Athens* (1816). Wilkins is not a very interesting writer, nor, by the highest standards, a very scholarly one.¹ He was well versed in the literary sources, and knew

1 See his interpretation of the inscription on the arch of Hadrian (*Atheniensiæ*, p. 49). He follows Chandler in reading 'Α ἰδεῖς Ἀθηναί Θησεως ἡ πρὶν πόλις' ('What you see is...') preferring this to Stuart's Αἰδ' εἶς' Ἀθηναί on the ground that Chandler is a scholar ranks above Stuart. His interpretation was refuted by Hawkins (Walpole, *Memoirs*, pp. 500f.). Basevi described *Atheniensiæ* as 'the greatest mass of absurdity ever given to the public'. Bolton, *Portrait of Sir John Soane*, p. 276.

his Vitruvius well. In 1812 he published a translation of Vitruvius, with a lengthy 'Introduction, containing an Historical View of the Rise and Progress of Architecture among the Greeks', the work of the Earl of Aberdeen. Aberdeen ('The travelledthane, Athenian Aberdeen', as Byron called him), later to become Prime Minister, was in his youth an enthusiastic student of Greek art, and had travelled in Greece at the same time as Wilkins.¹ His introduction was later published separately as *An Inquiry into the Principles of Beauty in Grecian Architecture* (1822).

The years 1810-15 were a period of great activity on Greek soil. In 1812 the second Ionian mission of the Dilettanti Society set out, consisting of Gell, J. P. Gandy (later known as Gandy-Dering) and Francis Bedford. They began by conducting some excavations on the site of Eleusis, where they discovered considerable ancient remains previously hidden. Thence they proceeded to Asia Minor, and among other ancient sites investigated the temple of Hera at Samos, that of Apollo Didymaeus near Miletus, buildings at Cnidos and Aphrodisias, and the temple of Artemis Leucophryene at Magnesia. On their return to Attica they excavated the temple of Nemesis at Rhamnus and examined Thoricus and Sunium.²

At about the same time more important results were being produced by an international group of archaeologists which included the Englishmen C. R. Cockerell and J. Foster, the Germans Linkh and Haller von Hallerstein, the Dane Brøndstedt and the Estonian Stackelberg. Perhaps the most gifted of these was Cockerell, who besides good looks and an attractive personality was endowed with a talent for drawing and a remarkable flair for architectural reconstruction. He set out in 1810 at the age of twenty-two, carrying official despatches for the fleet at Cadiz, Malta and Constantinople. At Constantinople he met Byron and also made the acquaintance of Foster, whom he describes as 'a most amusing youth'³ and who was to be his companion on many of his travels. After visiting Delos, where

¹ Both became members of the Dilettanti Society. Aberdeen founded an 'Athenian Society'.

² See *Antiquities of Ionia*, parts III and v. *Unedited Antiquities of Attica*.

³ Cockerell, *Travels in S. Europe and the Levant*, 1810-17 (1903), p. 18. Foster afterwards practised as an architect in Liverpool.

he did some digging without much success, he arrived at Athens and made the acquaintance of the foreign archaeologists congregated there, one of whom, Haller, became his intimate friend.

With Haller, Linkh and Foster he went to Aegina and made a thorough study of the temple there, which had been often visited before but never excavated. The effort of excavation was soon rewarded. 'On the second day', writes Cockerell, 'one of the excavators, working in the interior portico, struck on a piece of Parian marble, which, as the building itself is of stone, arrested his attention. It turned out to be the head of a helmeted warrior, perfect in every feature. It lay with the face turned upwards, and, as the features came out by degrees, you can imagine nothing like the state of rapture and excitement to which we were wrought. Here was an altogether new interest, which set us to work with a will. Soon another head was turned up, then a leg and a foot, and finally, to make a long story short, we found under the fallen portions of the tympanum and the cornice of the eastern and western pediments no less than sixteen statues and thirteen heads, legs, arms, etc., all in the highest preservation, not three feet below the surface of the ground.'¹

Two Englishmen and two Germans had shared in this discovery, and both parties were naturally anxious that the marbles should go to their own country. Cockerell and Foster offered to present their shares to the British Government, but by a series of unfortunate accidents Britain lost her chance. First an offer was made by Messrs Gally Knight and Fazackerly which was rejected as inadequate by Haller and Linkh. Next the Prince Regent offered a larger sum, and sent two ships to Athens to fetch the marbles, only to find that they had been sent to Zante to be sold by auction. Finally, when the auction took place, Taylor Coombe of the British Museum, who was sent to bid for England, did not appear, since he had gone not to Zante but to Malta where the marbles had been sent for safety. The auction took place without any English bidder, and the marbles were secured by Ludwig of Bavaria.

In 1812 Cockerell and his friends set out for a tour of the Peloponnese. At Olympia they failed to discover anything of note, but at Bassae their investigations proved successful and important. It was

Cockerell himself who discovered the buried frieze of the temple of Apollo.¹ He was scrambling among the ruins heaped up in the inside of the temple, making his measurements, when a fox emerged from a hole among the debris. Cockerell burrowed down into the hole and caught a glimpse of a hidden relief. He made a rough sketch and covered it up, noting from its position that it was only one of a series waiting to be uncovered. For the time being it was impossible to proceed with excavation, and Cockerell spent the summer of that year in Sicily studying the temples of Segesta, Agrigentum and Selinus. He made a thorough study of the Olympieum at Agrigentum, famous for the colossal figures which have given it the name of the Temple of the Giants, and was able to make a scholarly and convincing reconstruction of a building which had baffled all previous archaeologists.²

While Cockerell was in Sicily a party including Haller, Linkh, Stackelberg, Bröndstedt and Foster had armed themselves with permits, and returned to Bassae to make a complete investigation of the temple. This may be considered the first example of a large-scale organised excavation, and Cockerell's description of the operations from which he was unhappily absent shows that it was a gay and picturesque affair. 'On the top of Mount Cotylium, whence there is a grand prospect over nearly all Arcadia, they established themselves for three months, building round the temple huts covered with the boughs of trees, until they had almost formed a village (a city, I should have said), which they denominated Francopolis. They had frequently fifty or eighty men at work in the temple, and a band of Arcadian music was constantly playing, to entertain this numerous assemblage; when evening put an end to work, dances and songs commenced, lambs were roasted whole on a long wooden spit, and the whole scene, in such a situation, at such an interesting time, when every day some new and beautiful work of the best age of sculpture the world has ever known was brought to light, is hardly to be imagined. Apollo must have wondered at the carousals which dis-

¹ See Stackelberg, *Der Apollotempel zu Bassae*, p. 13.

² 'The Temple of Jupiter Olympus at Agrigentum', by C. R. Cockerell in *Antiquities of Athens and other places in Greece*, supplementary to the *Antiquities of Athens* by Stuart and Revett, 1830.

turbed his long repose, and have thought that his glorious days of old were again returned.'¹

The 'Phigalean marbles', as they were called, were safely carried off. In this case, unlike that of Aegina, the British made no mistake. The marbles were sold without a hitch to the Governor of the Ionian Islands for the Prince Regent, and now rest in the British Museum.

At the end of 1812 Cockerell joined T. S. Hughes on a tour into Albania. Hughes, a Cambridge scholar who later obtained a certain distinction as a historian, was in Greece bear-leading a young man called R. T. Parker. He afterwards described his tour in an informative work called *Travels in Greece and Albania*,² which besides containing a lengthy account of Albania and of the famous Ali Pasha, includes some letters of Cockerell and is illustrated by some of his drawings.

During a stay in Athens which followed this tour Cockerell continued his studies in Greek architecture, and satisfied himself by measurement of something he had guessed at before, the existence of entasis in the Greek column. The entasis of the Roman column had long been known, and had been copied by the architects of the Renaissance, but archaeologists before Cockerell had failed to observe that the same feature, more subtly used and less easily detected, is also to be found in Greek architecture. 'I have no doubt', writes Cockerell, 'that it was a general rule with the Greek architects, though it has hitherto escaped the eyes of Stuart and our most accurate observers.'³

In 1815 Cockerell moved to Italy, and in 1817 returned to England after seven years' absence. In the next year his friend Haller, with whom he had been so closely associated, died suddenly, while the joint work on Greek architecture which the two had planned was still unwritten. It was left to Stackelberg and Donaldson to describe the temple of Bassae;⁴ and Cockerell's fine drawings remained in his

1 T. S. Hughes, *Travels* (ed. 1830), I, p. 194.

2 1st ed. 1820, 2nd ed. 1830.

3 Cockerell, *Travels*, p. 265. According to Hughes (*Travels*, I, p. 294) the first hint given on this subject was due 'to an eminent architect named Allison, though he appears to have been led to it by observations of Mr Cockerell and the late Baron Haller'.

4 Stackelberg, *Der Apollotempel zu Bassae*; T. L. Donaldson, 'The Temple of Apollo Epicurius near Phigalea' in *Antiquities of Athens* (suppl. vol. 1830).

portfolios or served to illustrate the books of others. It was not until 1859 that his book on Aegina and Bassae was published, and by that time the discoveries of his youth had passed into history and the public interest in Greek architecture had waned.

The tide of taste that had flowed so strongly towards Greece ebbed rather rapidly between 1820 and 1830. Even in 1826 Millingen, a German savant who visited England, commented on the 'disregard entertained in this country for archaeological pursuits'.¹ The Society of Dilettanti fell into obscurity, young lords no longer prided themselves on their antiques, and the marbles their fathers and grandfathers had collected stood dusty and neglected in dark corners and damp summer houses. The growing interest in mediaeval architecture combined with other influences to turn men away from Greece. The architects gave up going to Greece to study; the antiquaries turned their attention to Early English, Decorated and Perpendicular rather than to Doric, Ionic and Corinthian; and in libraries Britton's *Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain* and Winkles's *Cathedrals* stood in the place of *Antiquities of Athens* and *Ruins of Palmyra and Balbec*. The great age of dilettantism, which was also the age which saw the beginnings of scientific archaeology, passed away.

1 *Ancient Unedited Monuments* (1826), II, pref.

CHAPTER XV

Architecture. The Grecian Revival

‘It is extraordinary how decidedly the public has adopted Greek architecture. Its simplicity, I take it, is suitable to English decision.’ B. R. HAYDON

‘ON THE publication of the first volume the knowledge of Grecian art burst upon the public in all its splendour.’ So writes the author of the Memoir of Stuart prefixed to the fourth volume of his *Antiquities of Athens*, and it is customary to date the Grecian revival in English architecture from 1762, the year of the appearance of this first volume. It cannot, however, be claimed that the effects of Stuart and Revett’s work became immediately noticeable. It is true that, as the Memoir goes on, Stuart ‘acquired the surname of Athenian par excellence; was chosen a member of the Royal Society and the Society of Antiquaries; became afterwards a member of the Dilettanti Society, acquired the patronage of many noble families in his profession of architect and had as much employment as he chose to accept’. But he soon gave up practice, his subsequent volumes appeared tardily, and the Grecian taste did not for the time being spread beyond a limited circle. There is no doubt, however, that the *Antiquities of Athens*, and other similar works mentioned in the last chapter, had a great influence on architectural practice. Not only did the authors of these works on their return from Greece reproduce in England the buildings they had excavated, but their careful measured drawings made it possible for those who had never visited Greece themselves to design in the Greek manner. The archaeologists were conscious that they were influencing English architecture. ‘A performance of this kind’, wrote Stuart, ‘might contribute to the improvement of the Art itself, which at present appears to be founded on too partial and too scanty a system of ancient Examples.’¹ The improvement of architecture was recognised as the principal object of the Society of Dilettanti.² It is therefore not unreasonable to

¹ *Antiquities of Athens*, I, pref.

² See Cust and Colvin, *op. cit.* p. 153. *Antiquities of Ionia*, part v, p. 4.

follow our account of Greek archaeology with a consideration of the revived Greek architecture which was based upon it.

The Palladian tradition, which had long been the main element in English architecture and was dominant in the mid-eighteenth century, was modified from about 1760 onwards by individual experiments, revivals and importations. The brothers Adam evolved a highly individual style within the framework of the classical tradition. Gothic, which had never been entirely forgotten, was demanded by a romantic like Beckford or a dilettante like Horace Walpole. The Chinese style influenced decoration and garden architecture, and even the Indian style made an occasional appearance in the early nineteenth century. The Grecian Revival was, however, rather different from such experiments and exotic importations. It is possible to consider it as a manifestation of the Romantic spirit, and some writers have so interpreted it, but it should probably be regarded rather as a development of the academic tradition. Academicism is the belief that an art can be based on rules and examples. These rules and examples were for long sought in the ancient world, and found in the precepts of Vitruvius and the practice of the Roman architects. With the discovery of Greek architecture the allegiance formerly given to Rome was transferred to Greece, and the new models which Greek architecture provided had all the prestige of antiquity in addition to their intrinsic beauties.

This academicism, which imposed on the modern world forms in many ways unsuited to it, is something of an anomaly in a period characterised by industrial expansion and utilitarianism, and in literature by romantic revolt. It may be in part explained by the preference for the original as against the imitation; just as Homer was preferred to Virgil, so Grecian architecture was preferred to the Roman architecture which was derived from it. The general admiration accorded to Greek literature and Greek institutions was no doubt also responsible for the popularity of Greek architecture; the Parthenon and the Erechtheum were all the more admired because they were contemporary with the creations of Greek tragedy and the glories of Athenian democracy.

The Grecian style did not make its way without opposition. Though a return to an ancient form of architecture it was nevertheless

an innovation, and as such disliked by conservatives. James Elmes records the feelings of some of the minor architects of the day, whom he depicts as 'hating the "new fangled Doric" (as they termed it) without a base, as much as they did a shirt without ruffles, or a wig without two good portly curls over each ear, and half a yard of tail behind; scorning its simpler flutes without fillets, which they compared to ribbed stockings; and sincere in their admiration of the swelling shafts, the rusticated and twisted columns of Batty Langley'. According to Elmes they 'lamented the shocking innovations of Wyatt and Soane, the more dreadful importations of Stuart, and were nearly going into a fever when the portico of Covent Garden Theatre¹ was opened'.²

A more distinguished opponent than these humble practitioners was Sir William Chambers, who followed the spread of the Grecian style with a watchful and malevolent eye. He noted that after the first outbreak of Grecian buildings there was no desire for any more, and 'the Roman manner obtained a complete victory'.³ The strictures which he composed for the second edition of his *Elements of Civil Architecture* were suppressed as hardly necessary. In 1791, however, he observed that 'latterly the *Gusto Greco* has again ventured to peep forth, and once more threaten an invasion', and the passages formerly suppressed were inserted in a new edition.⁴ He inveighs against the 'gouty columns' of the Greeks, 'their narrow intercolumniations; their disproportionate architraves; their hypaethral temples which they knew not how to cover; and their temples with a range of columns running in the centre, to support the roof; contrary to every rule, either of beauty or convenience'.⁵ He even asserts that the Parthenon is 'not so considerable as the church of St Martin in St Martin's Lane, exclusive of its elegant spire'.⁶ Chambers was fighting a losing battle. Willey Reveley, who answered him in the preface to the third volume of *Antiquities of Athens*, probably expressed the general opinion when he maintained that St Martin in the Fields, as well as being actually smaller than the Parthenon, could not be compared with its 'chaste grandeur, dignified simplicity and

1 By Smirke. 2 Elmes, *Lectures on Architecture*, 2nd ed. (1823), p. 390.

3 Chambers, *Elements of Civil Architecture* (ed. 1825), I, p. 135.

4 *Idem*, p. 136.

5 *Idem*, p. 128.

6 *Idem*, p. 116.

sublime effect'. 'The popularity', he goes on, 'into which Grecian principles are daily growing in spite of the feeble attempts that have been made to decry them, is the best answer to such undistinguishing assailants'.¹

When Chambers wrote of the 'first outbreak' of Grecian buildings he was no doubt thinking of Stuart and Revett, who were both practising architects, though of no very great distinction. Stuart designed for Lord Lyttelton a small Doric temple, to adorn his park at Hagley. He was also the architect of No. 15 St James's Square, a small town house of simple design, to which the Grecian Ionic columns attached to the façade give an individual character. His colleague Revett has left one interesting monument of Grecian taste in the church at Ayot St Lawrence, Herts, the earliest example of an English church in the Greek style (1778). It is in every way a striking departure from ecclesiastical tradition. It has a tetrastyle Doric portico, flanked by colonnades ending in open pavilions; there is no steeple, and the altar is at the west end. Exotic though it is, it fits into the landscape surprisingly well, as an ornamental temple fits into an eighteenth-century park scene. But in judging it it is hard to avoid criteria other than artistic. The old church which it replaced stands ruined and abandoned in the village, while the new church, turning its façade towards Ayot House and proclaiming in a Latin inscription that it was built by Lionel Lyde, baronet, lord of the manor and patron of the living, is evidently the expression of Sir Lionel's tastes rather than of the spiritual needs of the community.

The Grecian taste was at first mainly confined to Dilettanti circles, and the major architects were little affected by it. Chambers was an academic Palladian. Adam's style included some elements from Greece, but was more influenced by his own researches into the palace at Spalato, and by Roman domestic architecture in general. Soane was perhaps the earliest architect of the first rank to be noticeably affected by the Greek revival, though his style reflects his independent and even wayward character. In his lectures he deprecated servile copying from any other people or style. The main basis, however, of his own style was the antique, and he used Greek motifs, such as the Doric column. But he aimed at greater freedom and

1 The date is 1794.

fluidity than was allowed by the Greek column and lintel construction, and sought for models, at any rate for domestic architecture, in the remains of ancient palaces and villas rather than in temple architecture.

By the beginning of the nineteenth century Palladianism was almost extinct, and Grecian was the predominant style.¹ Throughout the country there arose churches and colleges, shire halls and assembly rooms with porticoes of plain Doric or elegant Ionic. Some of these have since been demolished, and survive only in old engravings, in such a book, for example, as *Metropolitan Improvements* (1829), where the new London buildings of the early nineteenth century are described and depicted. Here we can see, in addition to better known and still surviving buildings, Decimus Burton's Colosseum in Regent's Park, Smirke's Belgrave Chapel, S. P. Cockerell's Westminster Guildhall, the New Caledonian Asylum ('a chaste and classical design of the pure Doric order'), and the London Orphan Asylum, Clapton, with its chapel consisting of 'a pure Greek prostyle temple, with a tetrastyle portico of the Doric order, bearing an inscription on the frieze, instead of triglyphs, importing that it was instituted in 1813 and erected in 1823'.²

A long list could be made of early nineteenth-century architects who studied in Greece, a list that includes Wilkins, Cockerell, Smirke, Gandy-Dering, Inwood, and Basevi. Others, such as Decimus Burton and Playfair, who had not travelled, used the Greek style with as much scholarship as any archaeologist. Even a man like Nash, who was by no means scholarly or imbued with the Greek spirit, came under the prevailing influence, and adorned his façades with the Greek orders. It is impossible here to discuss all the neo-Grecian architects and their works. It will be enough to mention a few of the leading practitioners of the style.

William Wilkins (1778-1839)³ best represents neo-Greek academicism.⁴ He was essentially a scholarly architect, and his buildings

1 With Gothic as an alternative for country houses, and increasingly for churches.

2 Elmes, *Metropolitan Improvements*, p. 170.

3 See Beresford Pite in *Journal of Royal Institute of British Architects* (1932), p. 121 f.

4 Though he also designed in Gothic.

please largely because of their accurate reproduction of the best ancient Greek models. His designs are noticeably conditioned by his models, by Greek temple architecture and its characteristic feature the portico. Shortly after his return from Greece he was selected as architect of the new Downing College at Cambridge. Wyatt had originally been appointed architect, but his designs were rejected owing to the opposition of Thomas Hope,¹ who criticised them for not being in accordance with the best Greek models. Wilkins's designs in the Ionic style were such as to satisfy the most pedantic admirer of Greek architecture. Downing was closely followed by another similar work, the East India College at Haileybury. Here all the architectural effect is concentrated on the long low south front of Portland stone, with three porticoes in the Ionic order of the Erechtheum. Wilkins's third and most successful Grecian college is University College in Gower Street, which has a fine Corinthian portico on a high podium dominating a three-sided court. The National Gallery (1832) is another somewhat similar building, though here it should be noted that the architect had not a free hand, being forced, among other conditions, to use the columns from Henry Holland's Carlton House. In these two last buildings Wilkins departed from the unbroken sky-line of the earlier works, and introduced an un-Greek feature, a small dome over the central portico.

Not the best, but in some ways the most interesting of Wilkins's works is the now demolished Grange Park, near Alresford, Hants, built for Henry Drummond, which was distinguished by a heavy hexastyle Doric portico at one end, to which the rest of the house was subordinated. This was in fact an attempt to reduce a country house to the form of a Greek temple. Such an attempt was seldom made even in the heyday of the Greek Revival. The normal style for villas or country residences was a simple vernacular style, modified perhaps by a Doric porch or a few Grecian ornaments.

Another leading exponent of the Greek style was Sir Robert Smirke (1781-1867), architect of a number of important London buildings, the British Museum, the General Post Office, the Royal College of Physicians, King's College, Covent Garden Theatre, the

¹ See his *Observations on the Plans... for Downing College Cambridge in a letter to Francis Annesley*, 1804.

Junior United Services Club, and some rather forbidding churches. His buildings are heavy and lacking in charm. The British Museum with its monumental succession of Ionic columns is not unimpressive, but the effect produced is not commensurate with the number of columns employed. The charm that Smirke failed to attain is found in the works of Decimus Burton. He was born in 1800 and died in 1881, yet he belongs to the neo-Grecian period. He made his reputation at a very early age, practised with considerable talent the style of the day, and afterwards, when the style fell from favour, retired into obscurity. His work is familiar to Londoners, for his hand is to be seen not only in the terraces round Regent's Park, but in the Athenaeum, the Arch at the top of Constitution Hill, and the Screen at Hyde Park Corner. The influence of the Elgin marbles is to be seen in the graceful friezes on the Athenaeum and Hyde Park screen.

Though born considerably before Burton, C. R. Cockerell developed later, and his important buildings belong to the 1830's and 1840's. He is the most distinguished representative of the final stage of the neo-Grecian movement, in which an attempt was made to adapt Greek forms to modern requirements rather than to impose on the present the forms of the past. He combined a profound scholarship with remarkable originality and gifts of design. His long period of self-education included the study of the Renaissance masters as well as of Greek architecture, and he was thus able to preserve a tradition that was in danger of being lost at a time when Grecian and Gothic shared the architect's allegiance. It is safe to say that if he had flourished in the age of Gibbs and Hawksmoor, he would have equalled those masters in achievement and reputation. As it is, he lived in an age of noisy polemics, and was himself on the losing side in the 'battle of the styles', and posterity, too ready to judge a man by his historical importance, underestimates an architect whose influence on architectural development was far from proportionate to the quality of his work.

His first work of importance was the now demolished Hanover Chapel in Regent Street (1823, demolished 1896), which showed not only a scholarly refinement that was shared by many contemporaries, but also an originality that was rare among designers of the Grecian

school. There was an Ionic portico, after the model of the temple of Athene at Priene (described in *Ionian Antiquities*), but there were also two square towers, and a domed interior reminiscent of St Stephen's Walbrook. The design, so it was said, combined 'the intricacy and variety of the school of Wren' with 'the severe simplicity of the architecture of ancient Greece'.¹

Cockerell's later works fall outside our period and can be only briefly mentioned here. At both the universities there are notable buildings from his hand, at Oxford the Taylor and Randolph buildings (1839-45), and at Cambridge the fine block which is all that was completed of his design for a new University Library.² In London and the provinces he designed a number of commercial buildings, the Westminster Insurance Office in the Strand (1832, now demolished) the County and Westminster Bank, Lothbury (with Tite), the Sun Fire Office, Threadneedle Street (since altered), the Liverpool and London Insurance buildings at Liverpool, and a series of bank buildings in Plymouth, Manchester, Bristol and Liverpool (1844-5).³ In most of these the Grecian element is not pronounced; the requirements of urban and commercial architecture led the architect away from Greece in the direction of the Italian Renaissance. In the Bank of England buildings at Liverpool, however, he produced a building which is a model of the intelligent application of the Greek style to modern needs, something of which Wilkins would have been quite incapable.

The church architecture of the Grecian revival deserves separate mention. The early nineteenth century was a period of considerable church building. After the battle of Waterloo the nation became alive to the fact that the expansion of London and other towns had not been accompanied by the building of new churches, and large numbers of the population were unprovided for by the Establishment. In 1818 Parliament voted the sum of one million pounds for church building; the result was the erection of the 'Commissioners' Churches', so called from the commissioners who were appointed to administer the money. For the majority of these the Gothic style

¹ Elmes, *Metropolitan Improvements*, p. 100.

² Designs accepted, 1834.

³ He also completed St George's Hall, Liverpool, after the death of H. L. Elmes.

was preferred; Gothic as then practised had the advantage of being cheaper. But a considerable number of the churches were Grecian in style.

Here are some examples from London. St Pancras Church, St Peter, Regent Square, and Camden Town Church, by the Inwoods; St George, Camberwell, St Luke, West Norwood, and St John, Waterloo Road, by Bedford; St Mark, North Audley Street, by Gandy-Dering; St Peter, Eaton Square, by Hakewill; St Matthew, Brixton, by Porden; St Mark, Kennington, by Roper. The most famous of these is St Pancras Church, the work of William Inwood (1771-1843) and his son H. W. (1794-1843). At the west end it has a hexastyle Ionic portico, copied from the Erechtheum, and above an octagonal tower of two stages, modelled on the Tower of the Winds at Athens. The east end is apsidal, with attached Ionic columns, and on each side are Caryatid porches, copied from those of the Erechtheum. The church is thus an elaborate adaptation of the Erechtheum, though for the tower, a feature unfortunately absent from the original, the architects went to another Athenian model. It was not for nothing that the younger Inwood had studied in Athens and had written a book on the Erechtheum. But though there may be something rather absurd about reproducing a Greek temple, Caryatids and all, in the Euston Road, the reproduction is done with taste and a sense of design, and the building is certainly one of the most distinguished of its type.

The form of the Greek temple had to be modified in several respects before it was suited for Christian worship as practised in Georgian England. A peristyle church was out of the question; apart from the fact that it would have been far too expensive, to carry the columns all round the exterior would have meant excluding all light from the inside. Thus the body of the church consisted generally of a plain rectangle with large windows along the sides, while only the portico at the west end was whole-heartedly Grecian. Another problem was that of the steeple. This feature was demanded by convention, since it was the mark that distinguished the parish church from the chapel, but not sanctioned by Greek precedent. Convention proved stronger than precedent, and almost always the porticoes of neo-Grecian churches are crowned with a steeple of some sort. These

erections came in for a good deal of criticism in the later nineteenth century; they are perhaps least impressive when they follow traditional lines and challenge comparison with the steeples of Wren or Gibbs and slightly more successful when an attempt is made to create a new form in the spirit of Greek architecture. But a portico in the pure Greek style does not require the addition of a steeple, and perhaps the wisest solution of the problem was that adopted by C. F. Porden, who in St Matthew's, Brixton, put the steeple in an unconventional position at the east end, and left the portico at the west to stand by itself.¹

For the interior the Greek temple supplied no precedent, and the architects were generally content to follow the tradition of the later eighteenth century. Their interiors were galleried pew-filled rooms suited to the worship of the day and designed to accommodate large numbers at a small cost. They were contrary to all the notions of ecclesiastical propriety later prevalent, and consequently have seldom been left as they originally were, but have been made to conform in greater or less degree to later taste. Even St Mark's, North Audley Street, which Gilbert Scott considered so good of its kind that it should be left untouched, did not escape the hand of Arthur Blomfield, an architect who specialised in 'improving' buildings of this period.

It was not only in England that the Grecian style caught on. Scotland also produced some distinguished practitioners of the style, and whereas in the eighteenth century Scottish architects such as Gibbs and the Adams had practised mainly in the south, in the early nineteenth century there was plenty of scope for their activities at home. The Scottish capital was settled, prosperous and expanding, and began to adorn herself with a series of public buildings and monuments which gave a new meaning to the title she had claimed on account of her intellectual eminence, the Athens of the north.

The two leading Edinburgh architects of this period were Thomas Hamilton and W. H. Playfair. Hamilton designed the High School (1825-9) and the College of Physicians (1845). The former is one of the most distinguished designs of the Grecian Revival, and combines ingeniously two architectural forms, the narrow-fronted cham-

1 A similar arrangement is found in the church at Elgin in Scotland.

ber of the Greek temple, and the extended façade of later monumental architecture; though the model is the fifth-century Doric of the temple of Theseus, the general effect suggests not Athens but some Asiatic city adorned by the munificence of a Hellenistic king. Playfair's works are numerous; besides various terraces and squares in the new town, he finished Adam's University, designed the Advocates' Library, the College of Surgeons and the two Grecian porticoed buildings on the Mound, the Doric Royal Institution (1823-36) and the Ionic National Gallery (1850-9), both of which, in that they stand isolated, and are designed to be seen equally from all sides, are nearer to the Greek temple than for instance the London National Gallery with its single façade.

Playfair was also largely responsible for the present aspect of Calton Hill, which illustrates at once the peculiar Scottish love of memorials and the Grecian taste of the day. Here are to be found the observatory (1818), the monuments to Professor Playfair, uncle of the architect (1820), to Burns (1830) and to Dugald Stewart (1831), all, with the exception of Hamilton's Burns monument, the work of Playfair. Finally, there is the National Monument (1822). Playfair collaborated with Cockerell to commemorate those Scotsmen who had fallen in the wars against France by erecting an exact reproduction of the Parthenon. The scheme was too ambitious, and only twelve columns, with architrave, were completed. One can hardly regret that the building was suspended at this point. Even Cockerell and Playfair, with all their scholarship and taste, could not have reproduced on a Scottish hillside the life and colour of a Greek temple, and the completed edifice would have been cold and academic. Aiming at carrying into effect an archaeologist's dream the architects by a happy chance achieved the romantic's dream, and the monument as it stands is Greek architecture, not as it was, or as the antiquary imagines it to have been, but as the traveller sees it, fragmentary, picturesque and evocative. And because the effect was produced by chance, the integrity of the architects was not compromised; these sturdy columns have nothing of the artificiality of eighteenth-century mock ruins.

The Greek Revival began in 1762, with the publication of *Antiquities of Athens*. It is less easy to fix a date for its end than for

its beginning. But perhaps the most significant date is 1835, when the competition for the new Houses of Parliament was announced and the condition was laid down that the design must be 'either Gothic or Elizabethan'. Thus an official blessing was given to a style which, whatever use had been made of it elsewhere, had not been thought appropriate to public buildings.¹ Barry and Pugin, the joint architects of the Houses of Parliament, both in different ways dealt blows at the ascendancy of neo-Grecian, Barry by his introduction of the Italian style in the Reform Club, and Pugin by his crusading vigour on behalf of Gothic, and his fervent advocacy of the theory that it was the only true and the only Christian form of architecture. Supported as it was by an enthusiasm in which religion, patriotism and romanticism were combined, the Gothic Revival could not but overcome the Grecian movement, which was based only on scholarship, good taste and reverence for classical antiquity. Moreover, though Hardwick saluted the railway age with the massive Doric columns of the Euston propylaea, it was clear that the architecture of industry could hardly wear a Grecian dress. There was little hope of a union of past and present through the medium of Greek architecture, whereas some Gothicists were prepared to come to terms with the new age and its new methods of construction.

So the Grecian period passed away, and like all movements of taste fell into disfavour in the succeeding age. To mediaevalists of the school of Pugin neo-Grecian architecture was bad because it was not Gothic, and because it was not Christian; it was the expression of the materialism and irreligion of the age. Later, when the vogue of the Gothic Revival was past, it was condemned on different grounds, as a deviation from the great tradition of the English Renaissance, as a Revival, which, no less than the Gothic Revival, was an artificial return to the past rather than the continuation of a living tradition. To-day it is condemned not so much because it was

¹ In spite of the Houses of Parliament the Grecian style, or that modification of it which Professor Richardson calls neo-Grec, continued in use for public buildings in the 1840's. It seems to have lingered longest in Glasgow in the interesting works of Alexander ('Greek') Thomson. Dublin, it may be noted here, through the influence of Chambers and the late flowering of Palladianism under Gandon and Cooley, and also perhaps owing to the decline of the city which followed the Act of Union, is lacking in neo-Grecian architecture.

not Gothic or because it was not Palladian, as because it was not 'modern'; it restricted the development of architecture by an academic doctrine of imitation, imposed the tyranny of the text-book, and looked to the past rather than the future.

Such criticisms cannot be discussed here. We can only consider the most obvious charge that is laid against neo-Grecian architecture, that it is an imitation of a past architecture. This it clearly is, but if to admit this is to condemn it, it involves the condemnation of most English architecture since the Renaissance. Imitation in architecture as in literature is susceptible of various interpretations. A lifeless copy (and these are found not only in the Grecian period) is clearly of small value, but to the artist no less than the writer the past can prove an inspiration rather than a limitation. The better architects of the Greek revival were no doubt alive to the necessity of not merely copying the letter but reproducing the spirit.¹ But even though this principle might be accepted, there were difficulties in the way of its application. It was hard to adapt Greek architecture to modern conditions and at the same time keep its essential characteristics. A true criticism of the neo-Grecian movement is not so much that it was imitative, as that it imitated an unsuitable model.

The models provided by Greek architecture consisted almost exclusively of temple buildings, a form of architecture which resulted from conditions, historical, religious and climatic, which were wholly different from those of modern England. As we have seen, the Greek temple could not be adapted even for church architecture without important modifications, and it was considerably less suited to the requirements of commercial and municipal architecture. The essential feature of the Greek temple was the portico. This became the characteristic mark of neo-Grecian, and even though it might be used not

1 This is the theme of several writers of the day. Aberdeen for instance lays down that 'It would not be so much the details of the edifice itself, however perfect, which ought to engross the attention of the artist, but he should strive rather to possess himself of the spirit and genius by which it was originally planned and directed; and to acquire those just principles of taste which are capable of general application' (Aberdeen, *Inquiry into the Principles of Beauty*, p. 216). Cf. Payne Knight, *Analytical Enquiry*, part II, ch. II, § 54. Edmund Aldrich suggests that the architect should be like a translator expressing the thoughts of the ancients in modern language (*Designs for Villas* (1808), Introd. p. 1 c).

as the Greeks used it, but as an ornamental feature in the centre of a façade, it still limited the possibilities of architecture. It meant that, if the portico was to retain its Greek character and proportions, buildings above a certain height (normally two stories) were scarcely possible. The alternative was to do as Nash did and use the Greek orders for purely decorative purposes, which was contrary to the spirit as well as the letter of Greek architecture.

Again, it cannot be denied that Greek architecture is unsuited to our climate. The well-known refinement of Greek detail depends for its effect on the clear sunlight of the Mediterranean, and much of this effect is lost in the northern clouds and fogs. Moreover, Greek architecture excludes rather than admits the sunlight, and the Greek temple was unprovided with windows, whereas in northern Europe the maximum of light is required, and the development of architecture has in fact been largely conditioned by fenestration. The Greek style is admittedly well suited to picture galleries, which are lighted from the roof, but for other buildings windows are required, and it was not always easy to reconcile the necessity for light with the requirements of the style. There are country houses of the early nineteenth century where a heavy Doric portico effectively excludes the sun from the windows behind. The front of the High School at Edinburgh is virtually without windows at all, and when one considers that this front faces the south, one sees that its Grecian character has been attained only at the cost of a considerable sacrifice of convenience.

Such are the criticisms which the buildings of this period invite. The historian, however, whose business is to observe rather than to criticise, will not look behind the columns or beneath the pediments to spy out weaknesses of design and poverty of invention. He will be content to accept these buildings as signs of the hellenising taste of the period. He will notice here a reminiscence of the Parthenon, there of the Theseum, will observe Wilkins copying the Ionic of the Erechtheum and Cockerell that of Bassae; he will trace the motif from the Acropolis through the *Antiquities of Athens* and the humbler text-book to the provincial Baptist chapel or Assembly Rooms, and will see in these efforts to reproduce the forms of ancient Greece one of the many instances of the way in which modern Europe returns to the source from which so much of her art and thought and literature derives.

APPENDIX I

Nonconformist Education

A CONSIDERABLE proportion of the community in eighteenth-century England was excluded from the educational system for reasons of religion. It was impossible to enter Oxford, and to take degrees at Cambridge, without subscribing to the Thirty-nine Articles, and those who were not members of the Church of England were forced to provide a substitute for the educational system from which they were excluded.¹ The nonconformist academies,² as they were called, were something between schools and universities. They provided a three or four years' course of higher education; their main object was the training of young men for the ministry, but lay students were admitted, and the education was general. Sympathetic writers have contrasted the openness to new ideas and the encouragement to serious study given in the academies with the sloth and conservatism of the old universities, but whatever may have been the merits of nonconformist education, its strength did not lie in classical scholarship. The classical teaching provided in the academies was generally superficial and elementary, as was inevitable when the previous grammatical training of the pupils had been slight, and the teachers, however great their ability, had lacked the discipline of a public school education and the contact with other scholars provided by the universities.

The earlier generation of nonconformists, excluded from the universities at the Restoration, had retained and passed on the classical learning in which they had been brought up, but this old tradition grew faint, and in the later eighteenth century the academies generally attempted to provide an encyclopaedic curriculum in which the classics could have only a small part.³ At Warrington Academy in the 1770's classics occupied

1 Until the end of the eighteenth century dissenters, protestant and Roman Catholic, were forbidden to teach in England. This regulation was not however enforced. The Catholic gentry sent their sons abroad to Douai or St Omer. There were also a few small Catholic schools in England.

2 See Bogue and Bennett, *History of Dissenters* (1810); MacLachlan, *English Education under the Test Acts*. In the later eighteenth century the name Academy was also given to 'commercial' schools, patronised by those who did not want a grammar school education.

3 For curricula at nonconformist academies see Bogue and Bennett, *op. cit.* II, pp. 78-89; III, pp. 299-311; Bennett, *History of Dissenters*, 1808-1838, p. 129 f.

only one hour of the day, from 2 to 3 p.m.¹ When Joseph Priestley was at Daventry Academy in 1753 there was no provision at all for the teaching of Latin or Greek.² The part played by the classics would depend on the interests and abilities of the head of the academy. Secker, later Archbishop of Canterbury, had a mainly nonconformist education in the early part of the century. From Chesterfield Grammar School he went to an academy at Attercliffe near Sheffield. 'I carried with me thither a competent knowledge of Latin and not only of the Greek prose writers but of Homer and Hesiod, Aristophanes and Sophocles. But I lost much of this learning there.' However, at another academy at Gloucester he recovered his almost lost classical knowledge.³

It was seldom that Greek and Latin were completely ignored in a nonconformist academy, for a minister was expected at least to be able to read the Greek testament, and Latin was required not only by convention but also for theological reading. But the old conflict between religion and learning which was comfortably laid to rest in the established church, was liable to recur among men who believed that the preaching of the gospel was the one all-important thing. The stricter nonconformist view is put by Bogue and Bennett, the historians of nonconformity. In relation to religion, they consider, 'classical learning, the belles lettres, mathematical science, and the whole encyclopaedia of human knowledge bear scarcely the proportion of the glow worm to the sun'; if a minister was to be allowed to attend to studies which furnished entertainment rather than instruction, 'it must be in a very superficial degree'.⁴ The orthodox dissenter looked with a certain suspicion on the liberal culture which often went with unorthodoxy and latitudinarianism;⁵ while the more liberal divines tended to explore other paths of learning than the well-worn way of the classics.

Nonconformist ministers were not, however, all devoid of classical culture.⁶ Though not generally profound or exact scholars, many of them knew something of the classics, and could hold their own in learned company. There was Dr Adam Clarke,⁷ for instance, who conversed with

1 MacLachlan, *op. cit.* p. 227. Gilbert Wakefield, who was classical tutor at Warrington from 1779 to 1783 and later for a short time at Hackney, criticised the academies for their neglect of the classics (*Memoirs*, I, p. 346).

2 MacLachlan, *op. cit.* p. 153.

3 See Adamson, *Short History of Education*, p. 193.

4 *Op. cit.* III, pp. 265, 271.

5 *Idem*, IV, p. 299 f.

6 The Presbyterians and Independents had a better educated ministry than the Baptists and the Methodists.

7 Regarded by his fellow Methodists as 'a prodigy of learning'. He acquired a taste for the classics from his father, a farmer in Ireland, who read the Georgics and attempted to carry out their precepts. Bennett, *op. cit.* p. 530.

Porson shortly before his death about a Greek inscription, and wrote an account of his last hours. In the first half of the eighteenth century the best Greek scholar among the nonconformists was said to be Dr Zephaniah Maryatt.¹ At a later date the same title was given to Eliezer Cogan,² who was described by Dr Parr as 'an accurate Greek scholar and a diligent and discriminating reader of the best critical books', foreign as well as English.³

Cogan was entirely self-taught in Greek; he received no instruction in the language either at school or at Daventry Academy. As tutor of the same academy he gave some private tuition in Greek, but no official teaching. He was anxious that his fellow-dissenters should study the classics, and recommended this study to them in *An Address to the Dissenters on Classical Literature*, published at Cirencester in 1789. He recognised that the academies could not hope to teach the classics effectively unless the students were grounded in their schools; he hoped to see new schools flourishing in which young nonconformists would receive a sound classical education; he even suggested that clergymen of the established church should be invited to teach in them.⁴ He himself devoted most of his life to school teaching. In his school at Walthamstow he provided a classical education on traditional lines, including composition and versification in Greek and Latin; with his top class he read Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Aristotle, Plato and Demosthenes.

His contributions to scholarship were of no great note. He edited Moschus in 1795, but suppressed the edition immediately after publication. He contributed a few notes on classical subjects to the *Monthly Magazine* and the *Athenaeum*.⁵ But he was chiefly known as a teacher, and as an enthusiast who read Greek on his walks, even in London. When intro-

1 MacLachlan, *op. cit.* p. 176.

2 1762-1855. See *D.N.B.*; Bosworth, *Essex Hall, Walthamstow and the Cogan Associations* (Walthamstow Antiquarian Society Publications, no. 5); *Memoir of Rev. E. Cogan*, reprinted from *Christian Reformer*, 1855. Other nonconformist scholars were Joseph Cornish (1750-1823), author of *An Attempt to Display the Importance of Classical Learning*, 1783; Corrie, tutor at Hackney Academy, 1793-5, said by Parr to have 'an exquisite taste for the compositions of Greek and Roman writers' (Parr's *Works*, I, p. 674); and John Kenrick (1788-1877), tutor at Manchester College, York, from 1810, 'one of the first interpreters of the German methods of treating grammar and annotating classical texts' (MacLachlan, *op. cit.* p. 265). Wakefield, though he became a Unitarian and taught at academies, had an Anglican education.

3 Parr's *Works*, I, p. 674. It is said, though this is hard to believe, that Blomfield called him the first Greek scholar in England (Bosworth, *op. cit.* p. 8).

4 *Address to Dissenters*, p. 13. In the early nineteenth century some nonconformist grammar schools were founded (Bogue and Bennett, *op. cit.* IV, p. 307).

5 His contributions were collected together and published by his son in 1855.

duced to Porson he was described as one passionately fond of Greek. If this was so, Porson answered, 'Mr Cogan must be content to dine on bread and cheese for the remainder of his life'.¹ In fact, Cogan's devotion to Greek proved profitable enough, for his school was highly successful, and when he retired in 1828 he had amassed a considerable fortune.² The most eminent of his pupils was Benjamin Disraeli, who, though never in the highest form, read a considerable amount of Latin and Greek while at the school.³ If his knowledge of the languages was somewhat superficial, this was to be ascribed to his character rather than to Cogan's teaching. 'I don't like Disraeli,' said Cogan, 'I could never get him to understand the subjunctive.'

APPENDIX II

Greek Accents and the Pronunciation of Greek

THE MODERN reader who peruses eighteenth-century works of learning will notice that in some of them the Greek is printed without accents. In Warton's *Theocritus*, for instance, in Dawes's *Miscellanea Critica*, in Wakefield's publications, and in some of Tyrwhitt's, the accentual marks are missing. On further investigation he will find that Greek accents were the subject of considerable controversy during this period.

The abandonment of accents in print was the natural result of their abandonment in pronunciation. It seems to have been common in the first part of the eighteenth century to observe the accents in speaking Greek, and since in English accent is scarcely distinguishable from quantity, the normal Englishman pronouncing Greek lengthened the accented syllable and consequently failed to observe the Greek quantities. This accentual pronunciation produced, to give Dawes's examples, such words as εὐθῶδε, εἰρήκῳτων, πολέμων, θαπτομένοις, αγορευέσθαι.⁴ 'They that read Greek with the accents', wrote Cowper in 1785, 'would pronounce the ε in φιλέω as an η'. But I do not hold with that practice, though educated in it.'⁵ Cowper had learnt his Greek at Westminster in the

1 Maltby, *Porsonianæ*, p. 304.

2 Bosworth, *op. cit.* p. 8.

3 Monypenny, *Life of Disraeli*, I, p. 24 f.

4 *Miscellanea Critica*, p. 71. The examples are taken from the opening of Thucydides's Funeral Speech of Pericles, discussed by Dionysius Halicarnasseus, *De Compositione Verborum*, XVIII.

5 Letter to Unwin, Feb. 7, 1785.

1740's; no doubt there were other schools where the same tradition prevailed, though in 1754 a writer could say that most of the public schools had abandoned accents.¹

The sixteenth-century controversies about Greek pronunciation were concerned only with the question of vowel sounds, not with that of accents. The latter was not discussed in England before the eighteenth century. Bentley in his letter to Mill made a passing reference to the accentual notes 'quorum omnis hodie ratio praepostera est atque perversa',² but it was left to his nephew Thomas Bentley to begin the controversy with a few pages in the preface to his *Callimachus*, in which he attacked the prevailing method of pronunciation. Dawes made a brief but vigorous attack on accents, calling their champions 'barbariei plusquam Scythicae fautores', and their supposed usefulness 'merum insomnium ex porta eburnea profectum'.³ In 1754 Henry Gally of Bene't College made a more lengthy attack in his *Dissertation against pronouncing the Greek language according to Accents*. Roger Long of Pembroke, the astronomer, made a brief reply in the next year, and in 1762 John Foster of King's produced a more elaborate answer in his *Essay on the Different Nature of Accent and Quantity*. In the next year Gally produced a second dissertation; to which Foster replied with a second edition of his essay, with a reply to Gally's second dissertation appended. Meanwhile, William Primatt of Sidney had replied, independently of Foster and from a different point of view, in his *Accentus Redivivi, or A Defence of an Accented Pronunciation of Greek Prose*, 1764.

Of these Cambridge controversialists Foster is easily the best, and his scholarly and clear essay can still be read with some interest and pleasure. His position, which was supported by Markland⁴ and Taylor in his day and would be generally accepted now, was that although the accentual marks represented the ancient pronunciation, the pronunciation prevalent

1 Primatt, *Accentus Redivivi*, p. 409. Dawes in 1745 rejoiced that the *diu lateque grassata accentuum barbaries* had been banished from Eton (*Miscellanea Critica*, p. 70). Foster, a master at Eton, pointed out that though quantity was observed, the rules for accents were taught and their use recommended (*Essay on . . . Accent and Quantity*, 2nd ed., 1763, p. xii).

2 *Ep. ad Millium* (Bentley's *Works*, ed. Dyce, II, p. 363).

3 *Miscellanea Critica*, p. 72.

4 Markland characteristically wrote: 'The present common way of quoting Greek without Accents I always took for nothing more than a subterfuge for ignorance, except in a few Persons. At the best it was for me a sure mark that the Greek language was going out of England; and I was as sure that the Latin would soon 'follow it' (Letter to Foster, Appendix to *Essay*, 2nd ed., p. 392).

in England at the time, which lengthened the accented syllable, was incorrect; originally the accents marked tone and were not inconsistent with quantity. It was therefore possible to observe both the tonic accent and the correct quantity, and this Foster considered should be done, ignoring the difficulties presented to Englishmen by such an unaccustomed mode of pronunciation. Thomas Bentley's question, 'whether the pronunciation of Greek is better conducted by accent or quantity', was, said Foster, like asking whether in walking or running a man had better use his right or his left leg singly.¹

Gally's dissertation starts from the assumption that no one can observe both accent and quantity, and attempts to show that the Greek accents as we know them are not those of the ancient Greeks. The original Greek accent, he says, was 'entirely musical'² (this he does not adequately explain); the grammarians of Alexandria first applied the accentual marks to quantity. Later, with the introduction of foreigners into Greece, and the consequent corruption of the language, the accents were changed; the existing accentual rules reflect the corrupted pronunciation which had crept in. In his second dissertation Gally scarcely attempts to maintain this historical interpretation, but shifts his ground and lays down as his main point that 'the acute accent which we use makes all syllables with which it is joined sound long to the ear; and therefore that the Greek language should not be pronounced according to it'.³ With this Foster would have agreed, but would have added that we should therefore pronounce the accent correctly, not abandon it altogether.

Primatt agreed with neither Foster nor Gally. In his lengthy and rather confused book he maintained the antiquity of Greek accents, but rejected the idea of the tonic accent. 'Not only elevation of voice, but also such an addition of time, as seemingly, in the judgment of the ear, alters the quantity... is a necessary adjunct of the acute accent.'⁴ In poetry quantity prevails, and accents have no place. In prose the reverse is the case; 'an accented pronunciation... in contradistinction to reading by quantity, has always prevailed'.⁵ Primatt was in fact unable to imagine any other mode of pronunciation than that prevailing in England in his day.

Later in the century Samuel Horsley, the well-known bishop of Rochester, discussed the subject of Greek pronunciation with good sense though no great learning, advocating a reformed pronunciation of the

¹ *Essay*, 2nd ed., p. 305.

³ *Second Dissertation*, p. 88.

⁴ *Accentus Redivivi*, p. xi.

² *Dissertation*, p. 108.

⁵ *Idem*, p. 31.

vowel sounds, as well as an observance of the tonic accent.¹ The leading scholars of the later eighteenth century treated the subject only incidentally. Tyrwhitt was 'ab harum notarum usu alienissimus', but on what grounds we are not told.² Wakefield's attitude was characteristically violent; he scoffed at the champions of accents in the preface to his *Bion* and *Moschus* (1795), quoting 'Turpe est difficiles habere nugas et stultus labor est ineptiarum'. To which Porson replied in the first note of his *Medea*, appealing to the young to acquire a knowledge of accentuation and to persist in their purpose 'scurrarum dicacitate et stultorum irrisione immotus'. Porson's authority no doubt was such that the accents were henceforth secure from attack; the editors of some of Tyrwhitt's notes in 1822 abandoned their author's use, on the grounds that the neglecters of accents 'ignorantiae aut indiligentiae crimen hodie vix effugiunt'.³ Meanwhile, however, the accentual pronunciation, as opposed to the writing of accents, had been abandoned, and the student of Greek was expected to know the rules of accentuation but to ignore them in speaking.

APPENDIX III

Elmsley's 'Thefts' from Porson

ELMSLEY'S good name as a scholar is slightly tarnished by the story which was current in the early nineteenth century that he was guilty of appropriating Porson's emendations without acknowledgment, a story which was repeated in Sandys's *History of Classical Scholarship*. Its perpetuation in this standard work produced a vigorous defence of Elmsley from B. B. Rogers,⁴ who regarded the story of his plagiarism as a canard originating among the pupils of Porson at Cambridge. Certainly there is much that is legendary about the story. It appears in its most circumstantial form in an anonymous article in the *Church of England Quarterly Review* for 1839.⁵ The writer gives two occasions on which Elmsley was believed to have plagiarised from Porson. The first was in his review of

i *On the Prosodies of the Greek and Latin Languages*, 1796. In an Appendix he answers Primatt.

2 *Coniecturae in Aeschylum* etc. praef. p. vi. He also dispensed with breathings.

3 *Ibid.* 4 *Acharnians*, pp. 192 f.

5 Vol. v, p. 413. Professor D. S. Robertson tells me that Housman considered this article to be the work of George Burges.

Schweighäuser's *Athenaeus* in the *Edinburgh Review*, the second in his edition of the *Acharnians*. The emendations of *Athenaeus* he is said to have obtained from Porson at a dinner party (Watson's version¹ makes the two scholars meet in an umbrella shop); those of the *Acharnians* he took from Porson's papers when they were deposited at his death in Macinlay's book shop. Macinlay's cook, so the story runs, let him in on a Saturday, and he spent the rest of the day and the whole of Sunday transcribing. This highly unconvincing story, which rests on the testimony of an anonymous and otherwise inaccurate writer thirty years after the event, can certainly be rejected. There is, however, good evidence that Porson himself and his pupils believed that Elmsley had purloined his emendations. According to Monk, a responsible writer, 'many persons will recollect the indignation felt and expressed by Porson at seeing some restorations of different fragments in *Athenaeus*, which had been communicated by him to a friend, published in a review without the slightest acknowledgement or allusion to their real author'.² Dobree used to call Elmsley ἀρχικλεπτίστατος. Rogers rather unconvincingly regards this as ironical; if it was, it must also be irony when Dobree uses the words *furatus est* of a case where an emendation of Elmsley coincides with one of Porson's.³

The review of Schweighäuser, when compared with Porson's notes in the *Adversaria*, does not give any very strong evidence of plagiarism. Out of twenty odd emendations put forward only three coincide with those of Porson's, and nothing is more likely than that two scholars working on the same lines should light on the same emendations independently. As for the *Acharnians* Rogers points out that Elmsley's edition was probably through the press at the time of his alleged consultation of Porson's papers. Rogers holds that there is no similarity between Elmsley's notes and those of Porson. In his notes, however, Elmsley proposes several emendations of passages from other plays and authors which coincide with those of Porson.

It cannot be established for certain that Elmsley was guiltless, but it would be reasonable to suppose that Porson's suspicions were based on some misunderstanding, and that the whole affair was magnified by academic gossip.

¹ *Life of Porson*, p. 310.

² *Quarterly Review*, v, p. 207.

³ *Adversaria*, II, p. 22. Dobree's note was presumably not intended for publication.

APPENDIX IV

A List of Greek Scholars

WHO FLOURISHED BETWEEN 1700 AND 1830, WITH BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

(The letters *D.N.B.* are added in the case of those scholars who appear in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.)

WILLIAM ALLEN. Edited selected speeches of Demosthenes, 1755.

EDMUND HENRY BARKER, 1788-1839. See pp. 94-6. (*D.N.B.*)

JOSHUA BARNES, 1654-1712. Christ's Hospital and Emmanuel College, Cambridge. See pp. 60, 64. Also edited Anacreon, 1705. (*D.N.B.*)

WILLIAM BATTIE, 1704-76. Eton and King's College, Cambridge. Kept a flourishing private lunatic asylum. Published *Aristotelis Rhetorica*, 1728; *Isocratis Orationes Septem et Epistolae*, 1729; and *Isocratis Opera*, 2 vols., 1749, incorporating the earlier work. (*D.N.B.*)

RICHARD BENTLEY, 1662-1742. See pp. 48-50. (*D.N.B.*)

THOMAS BENTLEY, 1693-1742. Nephew of the above. St Paul's and Trinity College, Cambridge. Edited Callimachus and Theognis, 1741. (*D.N.B.*)

WILLIAM BENWELL, 1765-96. Reading and Trinity College, Oxford. Edited Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, published posthumously, 1804. (*D.N.B.*)

ANTHONY BLACKWALL, 1674-1730. Derby and Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Edited Theognis, 1706. Author of *An Introduction to the Classics*, 1718 (often reprinted). (*D.N.B.*)

CHARLES JAMES BLOMFIELD, 1786-1857. See pp. 87-8. (*D.N.B.*)

EDWARD VALENTINE BLOMFIELD, 1788-1816. Brother of the above. Bury St Edmund's and Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. Fellow of Emmanuel. Translated Matthiae's Greek Grammar. (*D.N.B.*)

THOMAS BRIGGS, 1767-1831. Eton and King's College, Cambridge. Published *Poetae Bucolici Graeci*, 1821.

AUGUSTINE BRYAN, d. 1726. Trinity College, Cambridge. Edited Plutarch's *Lives*, 1723-9. (*D.N.B.*)

JACOB BRYANT, 1715-1804. Eton and King's College, Cambridge. See pp. 138-9, 184. (*D.N.B.*)

GEORGE BURGESS, 1786-1864. See pp. 93-4. (*D.N.B.*)

THOMAS BURGESS, 1756-1837. See pp. 81-2. (*D.N.B.*)

CHARLES BURNEY, 1757-1817. See pp. 77-8. (*D.N.B.*)

JOHN BURTON, 1696-1771. Corpus Christi College, Oxford. His *Pentalogia* (see p. 17) appeared in 1758. Described by Elmsley as 'ab omni critica disciplina alienissimus' (*O.T.* Pref. p. iv). (*D.N.B.*)

SAMUEL BUTLER, 1774-1839. See pp. 91-2. (*D.N.B.*)

SAMUEL CLARKE, 1675-1729. See pp. 64-5. (*D.N.B.*)

WILLIAM COOKE, d. 1824. Eton and King's College, Cambridge. Professor of Greek. Edited Aristotle's *Poetics*, 1785. (*D.N.B.*)

ANDREW DALZEL, 1742-1806. See pp. 18, 44-6. (*D.N.B.*)

RICHARD DAWES, 1708-66. See pp. 52-4. (*D.N.B.*)

PETER PAUL DOBREE, 1782-1825. See pp. 88-90. (*D.N.B.*)

EDWARD EDWARDS, d. 1783 (?). See p. 66.

THOMAS EDWARDS, 1729-85. Coventry and Clare College, Cambridge. Published *Selecta Quaedam Theocriti Idyllia*, 1779. See *Bibliotheca Critica*, II, ii, p. 130. (*D.N.B.*)

THOMAS EDWARDS. Son of the above. Clare College, Cambridge. Fellow of Jesus. Edited Plutarch, *De Educatione Liberorum*, 1791. Unfavourably reviewed by Porson. See Porson's *Tracts and Criticisms*, p. 84. (*D.N.B.*)

FRANCIS HENRY EGERTON, Earl of Bridgewater, 1756-1829. Eton and Christ Church, Oxford. Fellow of All Souls. Edited Euripides, *Hippolytus*, 1796. (*D.N.B.*)

PETER ELMSLEY, 1774-1825. See pp. 97-9. (*D.N.B.*)

WILLIAM ETWALL, 1747-78. Magdalen College, Oxford. Edited Plato, *Alcibiades* and *Hippias*, 1771.

THOMAS FALCONER, 1772-1839. Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Published 'The Voyage of Hanno translated, with Greek text', 1797. His edition of Strabo (see p. 96) was based on materials left by his uncle, Thomas Falconer (1738-92), 'the Maecenas of Chester'. (*D.N.B.*)

- NATHANIEL FORSTER, 1718-57. Eton and Corpus Christi College, Oxford. His edition of certain of Plato's dialogues (see p. 66), published in 1745, was several times reprinted. (*D.N.B.*)
- JOHN FOSTER, 1731-74. Eton and King's College, Cambridge. Headmaster of Eton, 1765-73. See p. 225. (*D.N.B.*)
- THOMAS GAISFORD, 1779-1855. See pp. 99-100. (*D.N.B.*)
- HENRY GALLY, 1696-1769. See p. 225. (*D.N.B.*)
- JOHN GREENWOOD. Peterhouse, Cambridge. Edited Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 1823.
- BENJAMIN HEATH, 1704-66. See pp. 61-2. (*D.N.B.*)
- WILLIAM HOLWELL, 1726-98. Christ Church, Oxford. Published *Selecti Dionysii Halicarnassei de priscis Scriptoribus Tractatus*, 1766. (*D.N.B.*)
- JOHN HUDSON, 1662-1719. Queen's College, Oxford. Fellow of University College. Principal of St Mary Hall. Edited Thucydides, 1696; Dionysius, *Antiquitates Romanae*, 1704; Geographici Graeci, 1698-1712; Longinus, 1710; Moeris, 1712; Aesop, 1718; Josephus, 1720. (*D.N.B.*)
- GEORGE ISAAC HUNTINGFORD, 1748-1832. Winchester and New College, Oxford. Bishop of Gloucester, 1802-15; of Hereford, 1815-32. Author of *Μετρικά τινὰ μοναστροφικά*, 1783; *An Apology for the Monastrophics*, 1784; *A Short Introduction to the Writing of Greek*. (*D.N.B.*)
- HENRY HUNTINGFORD, 1787-1867. Nephew of the above. Winchester and New College, Oxford. Edited Pindar, 1814, 1821. Damm's *Pindaric Lexicon*, 1814. (*D.N.B.*)
- THOMAS HUTCHINSON, 1698-1769. See p. 66. (*D.N.B.*)
- RICHARD PAUL JODRELL, 1745-1831. Eton and Hertford College, Oxford. Author of three volumes of *Illustrations of Euripides*, two volumes (*Ion* and *Bacchae*) published in 1781 and a third (*Alcesteis*) in 1789. (*D.N.B.*)
- THOMAS JOHNSON. See pp. 59-60. (*D.N.B.*)
- JOHN KAYE, 1783-1853. Christ's College, Cambridge. Bishop of Bristol, 1820-7; of Lincoln, 1827-53. A candidate for the Greek professorship on death of Porson. Contributed to *Museum Criticum*. (*D.N.B.*)

NATHANIEL KENT, 1708-66. Eton and King's College, Cambridge.
Published *Excerpta Quaedam ex Luciani Operibus*, 1730 (several times reprinted). (D.N.B.)

THOMAS KIDD, 1770-1850. See pp. 90-1. (D.N.B.)

JOHN KING, 1696-1728. See p. 60. (D.N.B.)

RICHARD PAYNE KNIGHT, 1750-1824. Author of *An Analytical Essay on the Greek Alphabet*, 1791. See pp. 140-2 and 187-8. (D.N.B.)

MICHAEL MAITTAIRE, 1668-1747. Westminster and Christ Church, Oxford. Edited *Batrachomyomachia*, 1721; *Miscellanea Graecorum Carmina*, 1722; *Anacreontis Opera*, 1725; *Plutarchi Apophthegmata*, 1740. Author of *Graecae Linguae Dialecti*, 1706. (D.N.B.)

EDWARD MALTBY, 1770-1859. Winchester and Pembroke College, Cambridge. Bishop of Chichester, 1831-6; of Durham, 1836-59. Published new and revised edition of Morell's *Thesaurus*, 1815. (D.N.B.)

THOMAS MANGEY, 1688-1755. Leeds and St John's College, Cambridge. Edited Philo, 1742. (D.N.B.)

JEREMIAH MARKLAND, 1693-1776. See pp. 50-2. (D.N.B.)

EDMUND MASSEY. Christ's Hospital and Trinity College, Cambridge. Edited Plato's *Republic*, 1713.

JAMES HENRY MONK, 1784-1856. See pp. 86-7. (D.N.B.)

THOMAS MORELL, 1703-84. See pp. 60-1. (D.N.B.)

RICHARD MOUNTENEY, 1707-68. Eton and King's College, Cambridge. Published *Demosthenis Selectae Orationes*, 1731 (many times reprinted). (D.N.B.)

SAMUEL MUSGRAVE, 1732-80. See pp. 62-3. (D.N.B.)

PETER NEEDHAM, 1680-1731. St John's College, Cambridge. Edited *Geoponica*, 1704; Hierocles on the Golden Verses of Pythagoras, 1710; Théophrastus, *Characters*, 1712. (D.N.B.)

SAMUEL PARR, 1747-1825. See pp. 19-21, 76-7. (D.N.B.)

ZACHARY PEARCE, 1690-1774. Westminster and Trinity College, Cambridge. Dean of Westminster, 1739; Bishop of Bangor, 1748; of Rochester, 1756. Edited Longinus, 1724 (several times reprinted). (D.N.B.)

W. PIERS. Edited Euripides, *Medea* and *Phoenissae*, 1703.

RICHARD PORSON, 1759-1808. See pp. 67-76. (D.N.B.)

WILLIAM PRIMATT, 1712-70. See p. 225.

HASTINGS ROBINSON, 1792-1866. Rugby and St John's College, Cambridge. Edited Euripides, *Electra*, 1822. (D.N.B.)

THOMAS ROBINSON, 1701-61. See p. 65.

MARTIN JOSEPH ROUTH, 1755-1854. Queen's and Magdalen Colleges, Oxford. President of Magdalen, 1791-1854. Edited Plato, *Euthydemus* and *Gorgias*, 1784. (D.N.B.)

JOHN BARLOW SEALE, 1753-1838. Derby and Christ's College, Cambridge. Author of *An Analysis of the Greek Metres*, 1784 (several times reprinted).

JOHN SHAW, 1750-1824. Magdalen College, Oxford. Edited Apollonius Rhodius, 1778. New edition, with notes by Ruhnken, Toup and others, 1779. See Brunck in Tyrwhitt, *Coniecturae in Aeschylum*, p. 109, and *Bibliotheca Critica*, I, iii, p. 113.

BOLTON SIMPSON, 1718-86. Queen's College, Oxford. Edited Epicetetus, Cebes and Theophrastus, 1739; Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 1741; *Agesilaus*, 1754.

SAMUEL SQUIRE, 1713-66. St John's College, Cambridge. Dean of Bristol, 1760; Bishop of St Davids, 1761. Edited Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, with English translation, 1744. Wrote *A Defence of the Antient Chronology* and *An Inquiry into the Origin of the Greek Language*, 1741. (D.N.B.)

JOSEPH STOCK, 1740-1813. Trinity College, Dublin. Bishop of Killala, 1798; of Waterford and Lismore, 1810. Edited Demosthenes, and Aeschines, *On the Crown*, 1769. (D.N.B.)

JOHN TAYLOR, 1704-66. See pp. 54-5. (D.N.B.)

T. G. THOMSON. Edited Plato, *Parmenides*, 1778.

JONATHAN TOUP, 1713-85. See pp. 56-7. (D.N.B.)

THOMAS TWINING, 1735-1804. Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge. Edited Aristotle, *Poetics*, with translation, 1789. See pp. 150-1. (D.N.B.)

THOMAS TYRWHITT, 1730-86. See pp. 57-9. (D.N.B.)

JAMES UPTON, 1670-1749. Eton and King's College, Cambridge. Edited Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1696; Dionysius, *De Structura Verborum*, 1702; *Selection of Passages from Greek Authors*, 1726. (D.N.B.)

JOHN UPTON, 1707-60. Son of the above. Merton and Exeter Colleges, Oxford. Edited Epictetus, 1739-41. (D.N.B.)

WILLIAM VINCENT, 1739-1815. Westminster and Trinity College, Cambridge. Dean of Westminster, 1802. Author of *The Greek Verb analysed*, 1795; *Arrian's Voyage of Nearchus*, 1797; *The Periplus of the Erythrean Sea*, 1800-5. (*D.N.B.*)

GILBERT WAKEFIELD, 1756-1801. See pp. 78-81. (*D.N.B.*)

ROBERT WALPOLE, 1781-1856. Great-nephew of Sir Robert. Trinity College, Cambridge. Published *Comitorum Graecorum Fragmenta Quaedam*, 1805, to which Porson contributed some notes. Traveller and archaeologist. (*D.N.B.*)

RICHARD WARREN. Jesus College, Cambridge. Edited Hierocles on the Golden Verses of Pythagoras, 1742.

THOMAS WARTON, 1728-90. See pp. 63-4. (*D.N.B.*)

JOSEPH WASSE, 1672-1738. Queens' College, Cambridge. His Commentary on Thucydides was published in Duker's edition, Amsterdam, 1731 (reprinted Glasgow, 1759). (*D.N.B.*)

EDWARD WELLS, 1667-1727. Westminster and Christ Church, Oxford. Edited Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 1690; Dionysius Periegetes, 1704. (*D.N.B.*)

STEPHEN WESTON, 1747-1830. Exeter College, Oxford. Author of *Hermesianax, sive Coniecturae in Athenaeum*, 1784 (reviewed by Porson, *Tracts and Criticisms*, p. 38). (*D.N.B.*)

THOMAS WINSTANLEY, 1749-1823. Manchester and Brasenose College, Oxford. Camden Professor of History, 1790. Professor of Arabic, 1814. Edited Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1780. See *Bibliotheca Critica*, II, iii, p. 114. (*D.N.B.*)

APPENDIX V

List of Translations from Greek Authors

PUBLISHED BETWEEN 1700 AND 1830¹

I. POETS

AESCHYLUS:

- Prometheus*, Thomas Morell, 1773.
- Tragedies*, Robert Potter, 1777, 1779, 1808, 1809, 1812.
- Tragedies*, Anon., 1822 (prose).
- Prometheus*, Anon., 1822 (prose).
- Agamemnon*, D. A. Talboys, 1822.
- Prometheus*, T. W. C. Edwards, 1823 (prose).
- Agamemnon*, H. S. Boyd, 1824 (prose).
- Agamemnon*, John Symmonds, 1824.
- Persae*, W. Palin, 1824.
- Tragedies*, Anon., 1827 (prose).

ANACREON:

- Anon., 1702 (in *Examen Miscellaneum*).
- Various authors, 1713 (with Sappho).
- John Addison, 1735 (with Sappho).
- Ambrose Philips, 1748 (*Pastorals, Epistles, Odes... with translations from Pindar, Anacreon and Sappho*).
- Russell, 1758.
- Francis Fawkes, 1760, 1789, 1792, 1810, 1813 (with Sappho, Bion, Moschus and Musaeus).
- J. Reallie, 1761.
- E. B. Greene, 1768 (with Sappho).
- W. Cooke, 1776 (selections, in *Poetical Essays*).
- William Green, 1783 (see under PINDAR).
- D. H. Urquhart, 1787, 1810.
- Anon., 1796 (prose).
- Thomas Moore, 1800, 1802, 1803, 1804, 1806, 1815, 1820.
- Hercules Younge, 1802 (selections).

¹ See J. W. Moss, *Manual of Classical Bibliography* (1825); F. M. K. Foster, *English Translations from the Greek*, New York (1918); *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, II, pp. 758 f.

ANACREON (*cont.*):

Thomas Girdlestone, 1803, 1804, 1809.

Lord Thurlow, 1822.

William Richardson, 1824.

Thomas Orger, 1825.

J. B. Roche, 1827.

Thomas Bourne, 1830.

T. W. C. Edwards, 1830.

GREEK ANTHOLOGY:

R. Bland and J. H. Merivale, 1806 (*Translations, chiefly from the Greek Anthology*).

APOLLONIUS RHODIUS:

William Broome, 1750 (selections in *Poems*).

Jeffery Ekins, 1771, 1772, 1810 (*The Loves of Medea and Jason*).

Francis Fawkes, 1780, 1792, 1810.

E. B. Greene, 1780.

William Preston, 1803, 1811, 1813, 1822.

ARISTOPHANES:

Clouds, Lewis Theobald, 1715 (prose, from the French).

Plutus, Lewis Theobald, 1715 (prose, from the French).

Plutus, Henry Fielding and William Young, 1742 (prose).

Clouds, James White, 1759.

Frogs, Charles Dünster, 1785.

Clouds, Richard Cumberland, 1797, 1798, 1812, 1822.

Acharnians, *Knights* and *Wasps*, Thomas Mitchell, 1820-2.

Plutus and *Frogs*, Anon., 1822 (prose).

Birds, H. F. Cary, 1824.

Plutus, E. F. J. Carrington, 1825.

Acharnians, *Knights*, *Wasps* and *Birds*, Anon., 1830 (prose).

BION and MOSCHUS:

John Addison, 1716 (*Miscellaneous translations from Bion, Ovid and Moschus*).

Thomas Cooke, 1724.

John Langhorne, 1759, 1766 (*Bion's Lament for Adonis*).

Francis Fawkes, 1760 (see under ANACREON).

E. B. Greene, 1768.

W. Cooke, 1776.

Richard Polwhele, 1786 (see under THEOCRITUS).

Edward Dubois, 1799 (see under THEOCRITUS).

CALLIMACHUS:

John Alney, 1744 (hymns).

William Dodd, 1755 (hymns, with six hymns of Orpheus).

H. W. Tytler, 1793.

EURIPIDES:

Hecuba, Richard West, 1726.

Hecuba, Thomas Morell, 1749.

Iphigenia in Tauris, Gilbert West, 1753 (in *Odes of Pindar*).

Hippolytus, *Iphigenia in Aulis*, *Iphigenia in Tauris*, *Alcestis* and *Cyclops*,
Charlotte Lennox, 1759 (in *The Greek Theatre*, from the French).

Phoenissae, *Iphigenia in Aulis*, *Troades* and *Orestes*, James Bannister,
1780.

Tragedies, Robert Potter, 1781-3, 1807, 1808, 1814.

Tragedies, Michael Wodhull, 1782, 1809.

Hippolytus and *Iphigenia in Aulis*, Michael Wodhull, 1786.

Hippolytus and *Iphigenia in Aulis*, Martin Tuomy, 1790 (prose).

Hecuba, *Orestes*, *Phoenissae* and *Medea*, Anon., 1820.

Medea, T. W. C. Edwards, 1821 (prose).

Hippolytus and *Alcestis*, Anon., 1822.

Hecuba, T. W. C. Edwards, 1822 (prose).

Orestes, T. W. C. Edwards, 1823 (prose).

Phoenissae, T. W. C. Edwards, 1823 (prose).

Alcestis, T. W. C. Edwards, 1824 (prose).

Tragedies, T. W. C. Edwards, 1824 (prose).

Bacchae and *Heraclidae*, Anon., 1828.

HESIOD:

Thomas Cooke, 1728, 1740, 1743, 1792, 1808, 1810, 1813, 1822.

C. A. Elton, 1809, 1815.

HOMER, *Iliad*:

John Dryden, 1700 (book I, in *The Fables*).

John Ozell, William Broome and William Oldisworth, 1712, 1734
(prose, from the French).

Alexander Pope, 1715-20 (many times reprinted).

Thomas Tickell, 1715, 1779, 1790 (Book I).

William Broome, 1727, 1739, 1750 (parts of Books x and xi, in *Poems*).

Samuel Ashwick, 1750 (Book VIII).

J. N. Scott, 1755 (selections).

Samuel Langley, 1767 (Book I).

HOMER, *Iliad* (cont.):

- James Macpherson, 1773 (prose).
 William Cowper, 1791, 1802, 1810.
 William Tremenheere, 1792 (Book 1).
 Alexander Geddes, 1792 (Book 1).
 Gilbert Thompson, 1801 (*Select translations from the works of Homer and Horace, etc.*).
 Peter Williams, 1806 (Book 1).
 Anon., 1807 (*Specimen of an English Homer*, parts of Books I and VI).
 Charles Lloyd, 1807 (Book XXIV).
 James Morrice, 1809.
 R. Morehead, 1814 (Part of Book 1).
 Anon., 1821, 1825 (prose).
 Anon., 1825 (Books I and II).
 Anon., 1825 (Book I, prose).
 William Sotheby, 1830 (Book I, complete translation published, 1831).

HOMER, *Odyssey*:

- Elijah Fenton, 1717 (Book XI, in *Poetical Works*).
 Alexander Pope, William Broome and Elijah Fenton, 1725-6 (many times reprinted).
 William Cowper, 1791 (with *Iliad*).
 Anon., 1823 (Prose).

HOMER, *Batrachomyomachia*:

- Samuel Parker, 1700.
 Thomas Parnell, 1717 (and in Pope's *Odyssey*).
 Samuel Wesley, 1726.
 H. Price, 1736.
 William Cowper, 1791 (in his *Homer*).

HOMERIC HYMNS:

- To Aphrodite*, William Congreve, 1710 (in *Works*).
To Demeter, Richard Hole, 1781.
To Demeter, Robert Lucas, 1781.
To Aphrodite, Isaac Ritson, 1788.

LYCOPHRON:

- Lord Royston, 1806.

MOSCHUS: see BION.

MUSAEUS:

Laurence Eusden, 1709 (in Dryden's *Poetical Miscellanies*).

A. S. Catcott, 1715.

Lewis Theobald, 1721 (in *The Grove*).

James Sterling, 1728.

Robert Luck, 1736 (in *A Miscellany of New Poems*).

George Bally, 1747.

J. Slade, 1753.

Francis Fawkes, 1760 (see under ANACREON).

James Graeme, 1773 (in *Poems on Several Occasions*).

E. B. Greene, 1773.

Anon., 1774.

Edward Taylor, 1783.

G. C. Bedford, 1797.

Francis Adam, 1822.

ORPHIC HYMNS:

William Dodd, 1755 (see under CALLIMACHUS).

Thomas Taylor, 1787.

PINDAR:

Ambrose Philips, 1748 (see under ANACREON).

Gilbert West, 1749, 1753, 1766, 1779, 1790, 1792 (selections).

William Dodd, 1767 (selections, in *Poems*).

H. J. Pye, 1775, 1792, 1810 (selections).

E. B. Greene, 1778 (Pythian, Nemean and Isthmian Odes).

William Tasker, 1780 (selections).

William Green, 1783 (*Select Odes of Pindar and Anacreon*, etc.).

James Bannister, 1791 (Pythian, Nemean and Isthmian Odes, excepting 4th and 5th Pythians and those translated by West).

J. L. Girdlestone, 1810.

Francis Lee, 1810.

Abraham Moore, 1822.

P. E. Laurent, 1824 (prose).

C. A. Wheelwright, 1830.

SAPPHO:

Various authors, 1713 (see under ANACREON).

John Addison, 1735 (see under ANACREON).

Ambrose Philips, 1748 (see under ANACREON).

Francis Fawkes, 1760 (see under ANACREON).

E. B. Greene, 1768 (see under ANACREON).

Edward Dubois, 1799 (see under THEOCRITUS).

SOPHOCLES:

Ajax, various authors, 1714.

Ajax, Lewis Theobald, 1714.

Electra, Lewis Theobald, 1714, 1780.

Oedipus Tyrannus, Lewis Theobald, 1715, 1765.

Philoctetes, Thomas Sheridan, 1725.

Tragedies, George Adams, 1729, 1818 (prose).

Tragedies, Thomas Francklin, 1759, 1766, 1788, 1806, 1809.

Oedipus Tyrannus, *Electra*, and *Philoctetes*, Charlotte Lennox, 1759
(in *The Greek Theatre*, from the French).

Oedipus Tyrannus, Thomas Maurice, 1779, 1813, 1822 (in *Poems*).

Tragedies, Robert Potter, 1788, 1808, 1813.

Oedipus Tyrannus, G. S. Clarke, 1790 (prose).

Electra, William Drennan, 1817.

Tragedies, Anon., 1822 (prose).

Tragedies, Anon., 1823 (prose).

Oedipus Tyrannus, T. W. C. Edwards, 1823 (prose).

Tragedies, Thomas Dale, 1824.

Antigone, T. W. C. Edwards, 1824 (prose).

Philoctetes, T. W. C. Edwards, 1830 (prose).

THEOCRITUS:

Francis Fawkes, 1767, 1792, 1810.

Richard Polwhele, 1786, 1789, 1792, 1810, 1811, 1813, 1822 (with Bion
and Tyrtæus).

Edward Dubois, 1799 (in *The Wreath*, selections from Theocritus,
Sappho and Bion).

TYRTÆUS:

Richard Polwhele, 1786 (see under THEOCRITUS).

II. PROSE WRITERS

AESCHINES:

Against Ctesiphon, Thomas Dawson, 1732 (with Demosthenes, *On the
Crown*).

Against Ctesiphon, Abraham Portal, 1755 (with Demosthenes, *On the
Crown*).

Against Ctesiphon, Thomas Leland, 1756-70 (see under DEMOS-
THENES).

Against Ctesiphon and *De Falsa Legatione*, Philip Francis, 1757-8 (see
under DEMOSTHENES).

Against Ctesiphon, Daniel Spillan, 1823.

ALCIPHRON:

Thomas Monro and William Beloe, 1791.

ARISTOTLE:

Poetics, Anon., 1705, 1709, 1713 (from the French).

Ethics, Edmund Pargiter, 1745 (Book 1).

Poetics, Anon., 1775.

Poetics, H. J. Pye, 1775, 1778, 1788.

Politics, William Ellis, 1776, 1778.

Poetics, Thomas Twining, 1789, 1812.

Ethics and Politics, John Gillies, 1797, 1804, 1813, 1823.

Metaphysics, Thomas Taylor, 1801.

Works, Thomas Taylor, 1806-12.

Rhetoric, D. M. Crimmin (2nd ed.), 1812, 1816.

Rhetoric, Poetics and Ethics, Thomas Taylor, 1818, 1821 (*Rhetoric and Poetics* only).

Ethics, Anon., 1819.

Rhetoric, John Gillies, 1826.

ARRIAN:

Anabasis, John Rooke, 1729.

Periplus, William Falconer, 1805.

MARCUS AURELIUS:

Jeremy Collier, 1701, 1708, 1726.

James Moor and Francis Hutcheson, 1742, 1749, 1752, 1764.

James Thomson, 1747, 1755, 1766.

Richard Graves, 1792, 1811, 1826.

CHARITON:

Anon., 1764.

DEMOSTHENES:

Olynthiacs and Philippics, various authors, 1702, 1744 (*Several Orations of Demosthenes*, etc.).

Second Olynthiac, Lord Lansdowne, 1732.

On the Crown, Thomas Dawson, 1732 (see under AESCHINES).

On the Crown, Abraham Portal, 1755 (see under AESCHINES).

Public Orations, Thomas Leland, 1756-70, 1771, 1777, 1802, 1804, 1806, 1814, 1819, 1824 (with Dinarchus, *Against Demosthenes* and Aeschines, *Against Ctesiphon*).

Public Orations, Philip Francis, 1757-58 (with Aeschines, *Against Ctesiphon* and *De Falsa Legatione*).

DINARCHUS:

Thomas Leland, 1763 (see under DEMOSTHENES).

DIO CASSIUS:

Francis Manning, 1704.

DIODORUS:

George Booth, 1700.

DIONYSIUS HALICARNASSEUS:

Roman Antiquities, Edward Spelman, 1758.

EPICLETUS:

Anon., 1702, 1703.

Elizabeth Carter, 1758, 1807.

HELIODORUS:

Anon., 1717.

HERODOTUS:

Isaac Littlebury, 1709, 1729, 1737, 1818.

William Beloe, 1791, 1806, 1812, 1821, 1825, 1830.

Anon., 1824.

P. E. Laurent, 1827.

Isaac Taylor, 1829.

HIPPOCRATES:

Aphorisms, Sir C. J. Sprengell, 1708, 1735.

IAMBlichus:

Life of Pythagoras, Thomas Taylor, 1818.

On the Mysteries of the Egyptians, Thomas Taylor, 1821.

ISAEUS:

Sir William Jones, 1779.

ISOCRATES:

To Demonicus, J. Digby, 1712, 1822 (in *Epicurus's Morals*, etc.).

To Demonicus and *To Nicocles*, Anon., 1715 (in *The Prince's Cabala*).

To Demonicus and *To Nicocles*, J. Brown, 1735 (*The Duty of a King and his People*).

Orations and Epistles, Joshua Dinsdale and William Young, 1752.

To Demonicus, Joshua Toulmin, 1770 (in *Sermons . . . to Youth*).

Orations, John Gillies, 1778 (see under LYSIAS).

JOSEPHUS:

- Sir Roger L'Estrange, 1702, 1725.
 John Court, 1733, 1755, 1770.
 Henry Jackson, 1736.
 William Whiston, 1737, 1755.
 Ebenezer Thompson and W. C. Price, 1777-8.
 B. Neave, 1785 (abridged).
 G. H. Maynard, 1785 (?), 1800 (?).
 Thomas Bradshaw, 1792.

JULIAN:

- Two Orations*, Thomas Taylor, 1793.

LONGINUS:

- Anon., 1711 (in Boileau's *Complete Works*).
 Leonard Welsted, 1712, 1724.
 William Smith, 1739, 1742, 1743, 1751, 1752, 1756, 1757, 1770, 1777.
 Anon., 1830.

LONGUS:

- James Craggs, 1720, 1733, 1764.
 G. P. Le Grice, 1804.

LUCIAN:

- Various authors, 1711, 1745.
 Walter Moyle, 1727 (selections).
 John Carr, 1773-98.
 Thomas Francklin, 1780, 1781.
 W. Tooke, 1820.

LYSIAS:

- John Gillies, 1778 (*Orations out of Lysias and Isocrates*).

MAXIMUS TYRIUS:

- Thomas Taylor, 1804.

PAUSANIAS:

- Uvedale Price, 1780 (*An Account of the Statues, Pictures and Temples in Greece*).
 Thomas Taylor, 1794, 1824.

PLATO:

Selections, various authors, 1701, 1719-20, 1739, 1749, 1761, 1772
(from the French, *The Works of Plato Abridged*, etc.).

Phaedo, Lewis Theobald, 1713.

Phaedo, Anon., 1730.

Menexenus, Gilbert West, 1749 (in *Odes of Pindar*).

Io, Floyer Sydenham, 1759.

Hippias Major, Floyer Sydenham, 1759.

Symposium, Floyer Sydenham, 1761-7.

Hippias Minor, Floyer Sydenham, 1761.

Meno, Floyer Sydenham, 1769.

Erastae, Floyer Sydenham, 1769.

Alcibiades i, Floyer Sydenham, 1773.

Alcibiades ii, Floyer Sydenham, 1776.

Philebus, Floyer Sydenham, 1779-80.

Phaedo and Crito, Anon., 1763.

Republic, Harry Spens, 1763.

Republic, Thomas Taylor, 1792-3.

Phaedrus, Thomas Taylor, 1792.

Cratylus, Phaedo, Parmenides and Timaeus, Thomas Taylor, 1793.

Works, Sydenham and Taylor, 1804 (incorporating the translations by Sydenham and Taylor previously published, the remaining dialogues being translated by Taylor).

Phaedo, Anon., 1813.

PLOTINUS:

Concerning the Beautiful, Thomas Taylor, 1787-92.

Select Works, Thomas Taylor, 1817.

PLUTARCH:

Lives, Charles Gildon, 1710, 1713, 1718 (abridged).

Isis and Osiris, Samuel Squire, 1744, 1749.

Lives, Anon., 1762 (abridged).

Lives, John and William Langhorne, 1770, 1774, 1778, 1780, 1792, 1801, 1805, 1812, 1819, 1826.

On the distinction between a friend and a flatterer, Thomas Northmore, 1793.

Lives, Elizabeth Hulme, 1794 (abridged).

Lives, Anon., 1800 (abridged).

On Superstition, J. Hibbert, 1828.

POLYBIUS:

Edward Spelman, 1743 (*A Fragment out of the Sixth Book*).

Christopher Watson, 1747.

James Hampton, 1756-72, 1809, 1812.

PORPHYRY:

Select Works, Thomas Taylor, 1823.

SALLUSTIUS:

On the Gods, Thomas Taylor, 1793.

THEOPHRASTUS:

Characters, Eustace Budgell, 1713, 1714, 1715, 1718, 1743, 1751.

Characters, Henry Gally, 1725.

History of Stones, John Hill, 1746, 1774.

Characters, William Rayner, 1797.

Characters, F. Howell, 1824.

THUCYDIDES:

William Smith, 1753, 1805, 1812, 1815.

S. T. Bloomfield, 1829.

XENOPHON:

Symposium, James Wellwood, 1710, 1750.

Memorabilia, Edward Bysshe, 1712.

Hiero, Anon., 1713, 1750.

Oeconomicus, Richard Bradley, 1727.

Anabasis, Edward Spelman, 1742, 1749, 1806, 1811, 1813, 1830.

Memorabilia and Apology, Sarah Fielding, 1762, 1767, 1788.

Cyropaedia, Maurice Ashley, 1770, 1803, 1811, 1830.

Hellenica, William Smith, 1770, 1812, 1816.

Cynegetica, William Blane, 1788.

Hiero, Richard Graves, 1793.

Constitution of Athens, H. J. Pye, 1794.

Anabasis, Anon., 1811.

Minor Works, various authors, 1813.

Anabasis, Anon., 1817.

Anabasis, Anon., 1822.

Anabasis, Smith, 1824.

Memorabilia, Anon., 1827 (Books I and II).

INDEX

- Aberdeen, Earl of, 197, 202, 219 n. 1
Aberdeen, King's College, 42
 Marischal College, 42 n. 1, 43
Adam, Francis, 239
Adam, Robert, 208, 210, 216, 217
Adams, George, 240
Addison, John, 235, 236, 239
Addison, Joseph, 153, 159
Aegina, Temple of Zeus, 179, 203, 206
Aelian, 137
Aeschines, 36, 55, 233, 240, 241
Aeschylus, 6, 47, 58, 59, 60, 62, 70, 71,
 72, 74, 78, 88, 91, 92, 94, 101, 147,
 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 158,
 161, 164, 169, 170, 171, 173, 174,
 223, 235
 Agamemnon, 70, 88, 153, 235
 Choephoroi, 17 n. 3, 88, 149
 Eumenides, 17
 Persae, 88, 170, 235
 Prometheus, 4, 17, 61, 88, 94, 98,
 150 n. 1, 167, 170, 235
 Septem, 17, 88, 167 n. 1
 Supplices, 70, 94, 150 n. 1
Aesop, 42, 58, 231
Agrigento, Olympieum, 204
Aikin, Edmund, 219 n. 1
Akenside, Mark, 160-1
Alcaeus, 88, 163 n. 1
Alciphron, 241
Allen, William, 36, 229
Alney, John, 237
Anacreon, 21, 59 n. 3, 144-5, 166, 229,
 232, 235-6
Anthology, Greek, 170, 236
Antiquaries, Society of, 177
Apollonius Rhodius, 145, 233, 236
Apthorp, East, 92
Apuleius, 118
Archilochus, 158
Archimedes, 43
Aristophanes, 6, 12, 18, 31, 37, 53, 58, 71,
 74, 89, 96, 155-7, 161, 222, 223,
 236
 Acharnians, 98, 157, 228, 236
 Birds, 236
 Clouds, 17, 156, 236
 Frogs, 236
 Knights, 157, 236
 Lysistrata, 98
 Plutus, 17, 89, 155, 236
 Wasps, 157, 236
Aristotle, 37, 112, 114, 116, 117, 118,
 124, 140, 147, 223, 241
 Ethics, 37, 39, 114, 241
 Metaphysics, 241
 Poetics, 30, 37, 43, 58, 82, 114, 150,
 230, 233, 234, 241
 Politics, 37, 39, 241
 Rhetoric, 37, 100, 114, 229, 241
Arnold, Matthew, 158
Arrian, 36, 234, 241
Arundel, Earl of, 176
Ashby, George, 29
Ashley, Maurice, 245
Ashwick, Samuel, 237
Askew, Anthony, 5, 55
Athenaeum, 213
Athenaeus, 36, 74, 89, 98, 161, 228
Attercliffe Academy, 222
Atwell, Joseph, 65, 111
Aurelius, Marcus, 43, 241
Ayot St Lawrence church, 210
Babrius, 50, 58
Bake, Janus, 94
Baker, Sir George, 5
Bally, George, 239
Bank of England, Liverpool, 214
Bannister, James, 237, 239
Barker, E. H., 6, 76 n. 1, 85, 87, 93,
 94-6, 229
Barnes, Joshua, 2, 29, 52, 60, 64, 83, 229
Barry, Sir Charles, 218
Bartlam, John, 33
Basevi, George, 198, 201 n. 1, 211
Bassae, Temple of Apollo, 179, 182, 196,
 203-5, 206, 220
Battie, William, 5, 26, 229
Beattie, James, 12, 148 n. 3, 155-6
Beckford, William, 208
Bedford, Arthur, 111
Bedford, Francis, 202, 215
Bedford, G. C., 239
Beloe, William, 3, 90, 103, 241, 242
Bennett, James, 222
Bentley, Richard, 1, 2, 19, 30, 32, 48-50,
 53 nn. 2, 3, 57, 59, 60, 64, 65, 67,
 74, 75, 77, 124, 137, 152, 176, 225,
 229
Bentley, Thomas, 225, 226, 229
Benwell, William, 229
Berkeley, George, 115
Bion, 80, 145, 236
Blackstone, Sir William, 63
Blackwall, Anthony, 12, 19, 229
Blackwell, Thomas, 43, 129-30, 137-8
Blair, Hugh, 130, 134-5, 148

- Bland, R., 236
 Blane, William, 245
 Blomfield, Sir Arthur, 216
 Blomfield, C. J., 1, 3, 4, 6, 28 n. 2, 69,
 70, 85, 86, 87-8, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96
 n. 2, 98, 100, 101, 223 n. 3, 229
 Blomfield, E. V., 229
 Bloomfield, S. T., 103, 245
 Bocher, Joachim, 182
 Bogan, Zacharias, 2
 Bogue, David, 222
 Booth, George, 242
 Borra, G. B., 181
 Bossu, René le, 130
 Boswell, James, 116
 Bothe, F. H., 94
 Bourne, Thomas, 236
 Bouverie, John, 181 n. 2
 Bowdler, John, 12
 Boyd, H. S., 235
 Bradley, Richard, 245
 Bradshaw, Thomas, 243
 Bridgewater, Earl of, 230
 Briggs, Thomas, 229
 British Museum, 197, 199, 201, 203, 205,
 213
 Britton, John, 206
 Bröndstedt, P. O., 202, 204
 Broome, William, 124, 236, 237, 238
 Brougham, Lord, 11, 22, 47
 Brown, J., 242
 Brown, John, 138, 152
 Browne, Sir William, 5, 28
 Browning, E. B., 173
 Brunck, R. F. P., 58, 59, 62, 71, 96, 156,
 233
 Bryan, Augustine, 229
 Bryant, Jacob, 80, 138-9, 184, 230
 Buchanan, George, 40
 Budgell, Eustace, 245
 Burges, George, 53 n. 3, 77, 87, 93-4,
 227 n. 5, 230
 Burgess, Thomas, 4, 53, 57 n. 3, 58,
 81-2, 230
 Burke, Edmund, 131
 Burney, Charles, 70, 77-8, 83, 230
 Burney, C. P., 36
 Burns, Robert, 217
 Burton, Decimus, 211, 213
 Burton, John, 4, 17, 32, 81, 230
 Busby, Richard, 14, 16
 Butler, Samuel, 6, 14, 23, 35, 36, 37,
 85, 87, 91-2, 230
 Byron, Lord, 7, 69, 109 n. 3, 164, 166-7,
 168, 169, 170, 171, 186, 198, 200,
 202
 Bysshe, Edward, 245
 Callimachus, 48, 53, 88, 160, 229, 237
 Cambridge, Christ's College, 33
 Downing College, 212
 St John's College, 35
 Trinity College, 14, 29, 30, 34, 39
 Cambridge University, 25-30, 34-39,
 96, 112, 199, 200, 201, 221
 University Library, 214
 University Press, 70, 91, 96
 Camden, William, 16
 Campbell, Thomas, 68 n. 1
 Canova, Antonio, 196
 Carlisle, Nicholas, 16
 Carr, John, 22, 243
 Carrington, E. F. J., 236
 Carter, Elizabeth, 5, 115, 242
 Carteret, Lord, *see* Granville, Earl of
 Cary, H. F., 236
 Catcott, A. S., 239
 Cathcart, Lord, 186
 Cebes, Table of, 12, 233
 Chambers, Sir William, 209, 210, 218 n. 1
 Chancellor's Medals, 26, 27
 Chandler, Richard, 176, 177, 182, 201
 n. 1
 Chariton, 241
 Charlmont, Lord, 178
 Charterhouse School, 14
 Chatham, Earl of, 8
 Chatterton, Thomas, 58, 150
 Chaucer, Geoffrey, 58, 150
 Chesterfield Grammar School, 222
 Chesterfield, Lord, 11, 28, 144
 Chevalier, J. B. le, 183-4, 185
 Chishull, Edmund, 178
 Choeroboscus, 100
 Choiseul-Gouffier, Count, 183-4
 Christ's Hospital, 10 n. 2
 Chronology, Ancient, 110-11
 Chrysostom, Saint, 155
 Church of England and classical scholar-
 ship, 3-4
 Cicero, 115, 137
 Clark, J. W., 39
 Clarke, Adam, 222
 Clarke, C. C., 172
 Clarke, E. D., 69, 100, 179, 185, 198,
 199-200
 Clarke, G. S., 240
 Clarke, Samuel, 64, 65, 230
Classical Journal, 85, 86, 93, 94, 95, 101
 Clinton, H. F., 33, 36, 101, 109, 110
 n. 3, 111
 Cockburn, Lord, 44
 Cockerell, C. R., 181 n. 1, 202-6, 211,
 213-14, 217, 220
 Cockerell, S. P., 211

- Cogan, Eliezer, 223-4
 Coleridge, H. N., 142
 Coleridge, S. T., 119, 121, 143, 147,
 148, 153-4, 164
 Collier, Arthur, 115 n. 1
 Collier, Jeremy, 241
 Collins, Anthony, 137
 Collins, William, 161, 162-3, 164, 166
 n. 1
 Combe, Charles, 5
 Commissioners' Churches, 214-16
 Congreve, William, 146, 238
 Cooke, Thomas, 236, 237
 Cooke, W., 235, 236
 Cooke, William, 30, 84, 230
 Cooley, Thomas, 218 n. 1
 Coombe, Taylor, 203
 Cooper, J. G., 114
 Coote, Charles, 84
 Copleston, Edward, 13
 Cornford, F. M., 39
 Cornish, Joseph, 223 n. 2
 Corrie, John, 223 n. 2
 Costard, George, 111
 Court, John, 243
 Covent Garden Theatre, 209
 Cowley, Abraham, 146
 Cowper, William, 136, 147, 224, 238
 Craggs, James, 243
 Craven Scholarships, 26
 Crawford, Charles, 113-14
 Cretic, Law of final, 73-4
 Cripps, J. M., 199
 Cudworth, Ralph, 117
 Cumberland, Richard, 33 n. 2, 152-3,
 156, 236

 Dacier, Anne, 113, 126
 Dale, Thomas, 240
 Dallaway, James, 178, 184 n. 5
 Dalton, Richard, 178
 Dalzel, Andrew, 18, 21, 44-6, 47, 151,
 184, 230
 Dashwood, Sir Francis, 177
 D'Aubignac, Abbé, 136
 Daventry Academy, 222, 223
 Davies, John, 48, 51 n. 2
 Davies, Jonathan, 7, 26, 27 n. 1
 Dawes, Richard, 19, 49, 50, 52-4, 74,
 81, 82, 91, 98, 224, 225, 230
 Dawkins, James, 181
 Dawson, Thomas, 240
 Delap, John, 160
 Demades, 55
 Demetrius, 37, 46
 Demosthenes, 4, 21, 22, 33, 34, 36, 37,
 55, 108, 223, 229, 232, 233, 241

 De Quincey, Thomas, 76
 De Selincourt, Ernest, 172
 D'Hancarville, 188, 189
 Dickens, Samuel, 31
 Digamma, 65, 82
 Digby, J., 242
 Dilettanti, Society of, 177-8, 182, 185,
 187, 188, 189, 191, 194, 196, 197,
 202, 206, 207, 210
 Dinarchus, 55, 241, 242
 Dinsdale, Joshua, 242
 Dio Cassius, 36, 242
 Dio Chrysostom, 36, 81
 Diodorus, 167, 242
 Diogenes Laertius, 161
 Dionysius Halicarnasseus, 34, 36, 37,
 224 n. 4, 231, 233, 242
 Dionysius Periegetes, 31, 234
 Disraeli, Benjamin, 224
 D'Israeli, Isaac, 118 n. 2
 Dobree, P. P., 1, 20, 85, 86, 88-90, 100,
 101, 164, 228, 230
 Dodd, William, 145 n. 1, 237, 239
 Dodwell, Edward, 198, 200
 Dodwell, Henry, 110 n. 3
 Donaldson, T. L., 181 n. 1, 205
 Dorchester Grammar School, 21
 D'Orville, Philippe, 51, 100
 Downes, Andrew, 55
 Drennan, William, 240
 Drummond, Colin, 42
 Drury, H. J. T., 23
 Dryden, John, 103, 237
 Dubois, Edward, 236, 239, 240
 Duff, William, 121
 Dunbar, George, 47, 95
 Dunlop, Alexander, 43
 Dunster, Charles, 236
 Duport, James, 2, 83
 Dyer, George, 93 n. 1

 Edinburgh, Grecian architecture in,
 216-17
 High School, 41, 216-17, 220
 University, 41, 42, 44, 217
 Edwards, Edward, 66, 230
 Edwards, Thomas, 71, 230
 Edwards, Thomas (jun.), 230
 Edwards, T. W. C., 235, 236, 237, 240
 Egremont, Earl of, 189
 Ekins, Jeffrey, 236
 Elgin, Earl of, 178, 191-8
 Elgin marbles, 172, 188, 189-90, 193-9,
 213
 Ellis, William, 241
 Elmes, James, 209
 Elmsley, Peter, bookseller, 97

- lmsley, Peter, classical scholar, 1, 32,
 47, 51, 53 n. 4, 54, 64, 78, 85,
 92 n. 4, 97-9, 100, 140 n. 3, 164,
 227-8, 230
 lton, C. A., 237
 lyott, Sir Thomas, 112
 ntasis, 205
 pictetus, 5, 12, 115, 233, 242
 ratosthenes, 110
 rechtheum, 175, 181, 192, 193, 208,
 215, 220
 lton College, 14, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24
 lton Greek Grammar, 16
 ltwall, William, 230
 Euripides, 6, 21, 33, 58, 60, 62, 63, 70,
 72, 87, 89, 90, 94, 99, 100, 147, 150,
 151, 152, 153, 154, 163, 164, 166,
 173, 237
Alceste, 17, 60, 61, 87, 231, 237
Bacchae, 94, 98, 231, 237
Cyclops, 170, 237
Electra, 233
Hecuba, 60, 61, 72, 79, 80, 81, 98, 237
Heracleidae, 98, 237
Hercules Furens, 17, 98
Hippolytus, 17, 63, 87, 230, 237
Ion, 17, 231
Iphigenia in Aulis, 50, 51, 87, 237
Iphigenia in Tauris, 50, 51, 87, 98,
 146, 237
Medea, 17, 18, 73, 98, 99, 167 n. 1,
 232, 237
Orestes, 60, 72, 75, 237
Phoenissae, 17, 60, 73, 94, 232, 237
Supplices, 5, 50, 51, 98
Troades, 94, 237
 Eusden, Laurence, 239
 Eusebius, 100
 Examinations, 23, 27-8, 34-6
 Falconer, Thomas (1738-92), 230
 Falconer, Thomas (1772-1839), 96, 230
 Falconer, William, 241
 Fanshawe, John, 31
 Fawkes, Francis, 145, 235, 236, 239, 240
 Fazackerly, 203
 Fenton, Elijah, 124, 238
 Fielding, Henry, 120 n. 1, 152, 155, 236
 Fielding, Sarah, 245
 Flaxman, John, 187, 196
 Foote, Samuel, 21
 Forster, John, 173
 Forster, Nathaniel, 34, 66, 231
 Foster, John (architect), 202, 203, 204
 Foster, John (headmaster of Eton), 225-
 6, 231
 Foulis, Andrew, 46
 Foulis, Andrew (jun.), 46, 47, 70
 Foulis, Robert, 44, 46, 113
 Fox, C. J., 4, 7, 19, 80, 145, 152, 155
 Fraigneau, William, 30
 Francis, Philip, 240, 241
 Franchlin, Thomas, 30, 147, 149-50,
 151, 240, 243
 Franklin, William, 185
 Frere, J. H., 157
 Fuseli, Henry, 188, 194
 Gaisford, Thomas, 13, 32, 97, 99-100,
 231
 Gally, Henry, 225, 226, 231, 245
 Gandon, James, 218 n. 1
 Gandy-Dering, J. P., 202, 211, 215
 Garrick, David, 21
 Gast, John, 105
 Geddes, Alexander, 238
 Geddes, James, 120
 Gell, Sir William, 185, 200, 202
 George IV, 7, 196, 203, 205
 Gibbon, Edmund, 32, 34, 46, 69, 71,
 103, 107
 Gibbs, James, 216
 Gildon, Charles, 244
 Gillies, John, 13, 44, 105, 106-7, 114,
 117, 154, 155 n. 1, 241, 242, 243
 Girdlestone, J. L., 239
 Girdlestone, Thomas, 236
 Glasgow University, 40, 43
 Glasse, G. H., 77, 78, 83
 Gloucester, Academy at, 222
 Glover, Richard, 45, 159, 160
 Godwin, William, 168
 Goethe, J. W., 130, 187
 Goldsmith, Oliver, 103
 Goodall, Joseph, 77
 Gordon, John, 135
 Graeme, James, 239
 Grange Park, Hants, 212
 Granville, Earl of, 8, 9
 Graves, Richard, 241, 245
 Gray, Thomas, 25-6, 30, 84, 111 n. 7,
 112, 120, 146, 158, 159, 161-2,
 163, 164
 Great Blencow Grammar School, 21
 Green, William, 235, 239
 Greene, E. B., 145, 235, 236, 239
 Greenwood, John, 231
 Grenville, Earl of, 7, 28
 Grote, George, 14, 108, 109-10, 159
 Gunning, Henry, 33
 Hackney Academy, 222 n. 1, 223 n. 2
 Haileybury College, 212
 Hakewill, Henry, 215

- Hales, William, 110
 Haller von Hallerstein, Baron, 202, 203, 204, 205
 Hamilton, Thomas, 216, 217
 Hamilton, Sir William, 177, 178, 186, 188, 189
 Hampton, James, 3, 5, 103, 245
 Hanover Chapel, 213
 Hardwick, Philip, 218
 Hare, Julius, 101
 Harris, James, 115-16, 117
 Harrison, Thomas, 191
 Harrow School, 19, 23
 Hawkins, Sir John, 69
 Hawkins, John, 201 n. 1
 Hawtrey, E. C., 23
 Haydon, B. R., 172, 190, 194-5
 Hazlitt, William, 68
 Hearne, Thomas, 31, 59
 Heath, Benjamin, 61-2, 74, 231
 Heberden, William, 5, 50
 Heliodorus, 242
 Hemsterhuys, Tiberius, 49
 Henry VIII, 28
 Hephaestion, 49, 100
 Herder, J. G., 130
 Hermarin, J. G. J., 73, 88, 94, 98
 Hermesianax, 84
 Herodotus, 18, 21, 37, 42, 46, 47, 66, 100, 103, 106, 140, 158, 242
 Hertford Grammar School, 22
 Hertford Scholarships, 26
 Hesiod, 37, 65, 100, 222, 237
 Heversham Grammar School, 21
 Hewlett, John, 71
 Heyne, C. G., 64, 82, 96, 98, 141
 Hibbert, J., 244
 Hierocles, 100, 232, 234
 Hill, H. D., 12, 46 n. 1
 Hill, John, 245
 Hippocrates, 242
 Hobhouse, J. C., 180 n. 1, 198, 199, 200
 Hody, Humphrey, 30
 Hole, Richard, 142 n. 5, 238
 Holwell, William, 231
 Homer, 6, 7, 8, 17, 21, 31, 33, 48, 53, 64-5, 82, 98, 120, 123-43, 144, 147, 152, 153, 159, 165, 181, 183, 184, 187, 222
Batrachomyomachia, 232, 238
Iliad, 2, 8, 15, 17, 18, 34, 37, 42, 46, 64, 65, 123, 124, 127, 128, 130 nn. 2, 4, 135, 136, 137, 138, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 159, 167, 237-8
Odyssey, 2, 18, 37, 42, 46, 64, 124, 128, 130 n. 4, 136, 137, 138, 141, 142, 238
 Homeric Hymns, 170, 238
 Homeric Question, 124, 136-43
 Hope, Thomas, 185-6, 189, 212
 Horace, 15, 124
 Horner, Francis, 7
 Horsley, Samuel, 226-7
 Houses of Parliament, 218
 Housman, A. E., 1, 51, 54, 75, 227 n. 5
 Howell, F., 245
 Hudson, John, 231
 Hughes, T. S., 87, 205
 Hugues, P. F., *see* D'Hancarville
 Hulme, Elizabeth, 244
 Hume, David, 117, 148
 Hunt, Philip, 192
 Hunter, Robert, 42, 44
 Huntingford, G. I., 71, 77, 83-4, 231
 Huntingford, Henry, 231
 Hurd, Richard, 121, 133-4, 148, 165
 Hurdis, James, 34, 35
 Hutcheson, Francis, 43 n. 5, 241
 Hutchinson, Thomas, 66, 231
 Hyde Park Corner Screen, 213
 Iamblichus, 118, 242
 Inwood, William, 215
 Inwood, W. H., 211, 215
 Ireland Scholarships, 26
 Isaeus, 36, 58, 242
 Isocrates, 5, 36, 37, 229, 242
 Jackson, Cyril, 32, 33, 99
 Jackson, Henry (translator of Josephus), 243
 Jackson, Henry (professor of Greek at Cambridge), 39
 Jackson, John, 110
 Jackson, William, 32
 James, Thomas, 15, 172
 Jebb, Sir R. C., 48, 49, 60, 62
 Jenkins, John, 181 n. 1
 Jodrell, R. P., 231
 Johnson, Samuel, 32, 33, 54, 66, 83, 116, 125, 130, 131, 137, 147, 161, 164
 Johnson, Thomas, 59-60, 231
 Jorden, William, 32
 Josephus, 231, 243
 Julian, 118, 243
 Kames, Lord, 148-9
 Kaye, John, 231
 Keate, John, 17, 18
 Keats, John, 158, 159, 164, 165, 171-2
 Kedington, Roger, 132 n. 1
 Kennedy, B. H., 23
 Kennet, Basil, 146

- rick, John, 223 n. 2
 t, Nathaniel, 232
 W. P., 58
 d, Thomas, 53, 70, 90-1, 232
 g, John, 4, 60, 61, 232
 naird, William, 181 n. 1
 ght, H. Gally, 203
 ght, R. P., 71, 96, 140-2, 145, 177,
 187-8, 189, 194, 196, 197, 232
 ox, Vicesimus, 12, 13, 142 n. 5, 144
- hmann, Karl, 75
 ng, William, 47, 67 n. 1
 mbert, James, 30
 ndor, W. S., 77, 159, 164, 172-4
 nghorne, John, 103, 236, 244
 nghorne, William, 103, 244
 ngley, Batty, 209
 ngley, Samuel, 237
 nsdowne, Lord (George Granville),
 241
 nsdowne, Marquess of, 189
 urent, P. E., 239, 242
 sake, W. M., 185, 200-1
 ee, Francis, 239
 e Grice, G. P., 243
 eland, Thomas, 104-5, 240, 241, 242
 empriere, John, 95, 139 n. 1, 171,
 172
 empster, Lord, 176 n. 2
 ennox, Charlotte, 237, 240
 essage, G. E., 187
 'Estrange, Sir Roger, 243
 illo, George, 153
 linkh, Jakob, 202, 203, 204
 Litchfield, Earl of, 28
 Littlebury, Isaac, 103, 242
 Lloyd, Charles, 238
 Locke, John, 10, 11, 115, 117
 Long, Roger, 225
 Longinus, 43, 56, 57, 103, 124, 158, 231,
 232, 243
 Longley, G. T., 23
 Longus, 243
 Lort, Michael, 30
 Louth Grammar School, 21
 Lucas, Robert, 238
 Lucian, 12, 17, 18, 22, 30, 42, 232, 243
 Luck, Robert, 239
 Lucretius, 80, 81
 Ludwig of Bavaria, Prince, 195, 203
 Lusieri, Titta, 191, 192, 193
 Lycophron, 4, 7, 145, 155, 238
 Lycurgus, 55
 Lyde, Sir Lionel, 210
 Lysias, 36, 37, 55, 90, 243
 Lyttelton, Lord, 210
- Macaulay, T. B., 108 n. 5, 110, 130
 Macinlay, 228
 Maclaren, Charles, 185
 Macpherson, James, 135-6, 138, 238
 McQueen, Donald, 137
 Maittaire, Michael, 232
 Maltby, Edward, 4, 19, 27, 61, 232
 Maltby, William, 90
 Manchester College, York, 223 n. 2
 Mangey, Thomas, 51 n. 2, 232
 Manning, Francis, 242
 Market Bosworth Grammar School, 19
 Markland, Jeremiah, 5, 29, 32, 49, 50-2,
 55, 63, 74, 98, 100, 225, 232
 Maryatt, Zephaniah, 223
 Mason, William, 83, 162, 164
 Massey, Edmund, 232
 Mathias, T. J., 84
 Maty's *New Review*, 71
 Maurice, F. D., 38
 Maurice, Thomas, 240
 Maximus Tyrius, 118, 243
 Maynard, G. H., 243
 Mayor, J. E. B., 91, 92
 Mead, Richard, 5, 176
 Meen, Henry, 145
 Melville, Andrew, 40
 Members' Prizes, 28
 Menander, 48, 154
 Meredith, William, 118 n. 1
 Merivale, J. H., 236
 Mill, J. S., 15
 Milles, Thomas, 31
 Millingen, James, 206
 Milman, H. H., 140, 142
 Milton, John, 83, 136, 158
 Mitchell, Thomas, 156-7, 236
 Mitford, William, 103, 104, 107-9, 110,
 111, 167, 169
 Moeris, 231
 Monboddio, Lord, 114, 115-17, 131
 Monk, J. H., 4, 34, 35, 48, 85, 86-7,
 101, 228, 232
 Monro, Thomas, 241
 Montfaucon, Bernard de, 65
Monthly Review, 71
 Moor, James, 43, 46, 241
 Moore, Abraham, 239
 Moore, Thomas, 144, 235
 Morehead, R., 238
 Morell, Thomas, 60-1, 232, 235, 237
 Morrice, James, 238
 Morritt, J. B. S., 178, 179, 182, 183,
 184-5, 197
 Moschus, 80, 145, 170, 223, 236, 238
 Mounteney, Richard, 34, 232
 Moyle, Walter, 243

- Muirhead, George, 44, 46
 Muirhead, J. H., 115
Musae Etonenses, 18, 23, 84
 Musaeus, 145, 239
Museum Criticum, 86, 87, 88, 101, 164
 Musgrave, Samuel, 4, 6, 51 n. 2, 55, 58,
 61, 62-3, 74, 98, 111, 232
 Mythology, Ancient, 159, 165-6
 Mytton, John, 6
- Nares, Robert, 114 n. 1
 Nash, John, 211, 220
 National Gallery, London, 212, 217
 Neave, B., 243
 Needham, Peter, 232
 Newport Grammar School, 22
 Newton, Sir Isaac, 110-11
 Newton, William, 181 n. 1
 Nollekens, Joseph, 196
 Norbury, J. G., 84
 Norfolk, Duke of, 118 n. 1
 Norris, John, 115 n. 1
 Northmore, Thomas, 244
 Nottingham High School, 19
- Observer, The*, 152, 156
 Oldisworth, William, 237
 Olympia, 192, 203
 Orger, Thomas, 236
 Orme, Thomas, 16 n. 1
 Orpheus, 58, 119
 Orphic Hymns, 118, 239
 Ossian, 134-6
 Orway, Thomas, 45
 Owen, Henry, 66 n. 3
 Oxford, Balliol College, 33
 Christ Church, 14, 33
 Magdalen College, 34
 Merton College, 33
 Pembroke College, 33
 Oxford University, 25-6, 28-9, 30-5,
 36, 97, 112, 221
 University Press, 63, 96
 Ozell, John, 237
- Palin, W., 235
 Pargiter, Edward, 114 n. 3, 241
 Parker, R. T., 205
 Parker, Samuel, 238
 Parnell, Thomas, 128, 238
 Parr, Samuel, 4, 14, 19-20, 21, 29, 33,
 36, 71, 76-7, 83, 85, 90, 92, 95,
 96, 172, 173, 223, 232
 Pars, William, 182
 Parthenon, 167, 175, 179, 181, 192, 193,
 208, 209, 217, 220
 Pausanias, 118, 137, 161, 242
- Pauw, J. C. de, 62, 70
 Peacock, T. L., 165, 168
 Pearce, Zachary, 232
 Pearson, John, 2
 Pembroke, Earl of, 176 n. 2
 Penn, Granville, 140
 Perceval, Spencer, 195
 Percy, Thomas, 134, 150
 Pericles, 174
 Petrus de Marsiliis, 40
 Petty, William, 176
 Phaedrus, 151
 Phalaris, 30, 33, 48, 49
 Philemon (comic poet), 48
 Philemon (lexicographer), 78
 Philip of Macedon, 104-5, 108
 Phillips, Ambrose, 235, 239
Philological Museum, 101
 Photius, 77, 89
 Physicians, learned, 4-5
 Piers, W., 232
 Pilgrim, Thomas, 29
 Pindar, 21, 22, 37, 53, 96, 145, 146-7,
 151, 162-3, 173, 231, 239
 Pisistratus, 128, 137, 138, 140, 142, 143
 Pitt, Thomas, 8
 Pitt, William (elder), *see* Chatham
 Pitt, William (younger), 7, 145
 Plato, 12, 18, 34, 37, 46, 47, 66, 94,
 112-14, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119,
 120-2, 140, 158, 161, 165, 168, 169,
 173, 223, 231, 244
Alcibiades i and ii, 230, 244
Apology, 37, 66
Cratylus, 244
Crito, 37, 66, 244
Erastae, 66, 244
Euthydemus, 233
Euthyphro, 37, 66
Gorgias, 233
Hippias i and ii, 230, 244
Io, 244
Laws, 157
Menexenus, 122, 244
Meno, 244
Phaedo, 37, 66, 113, 120, 244
Phaedrus, 244
Philebus, 244
Republic, 122, 244
Symposium, 122, 244
Timaeus, 244
- Playfair, John, 217
 Playfair, W. H., 211, 216, 217
 Plotinus, 118, 119, 244
 Plumptre, John, 84
 Plutarch, 58, 71, 82, 96, 103, 229, 230,
 232, 233, 244

- Pococke, Richard, 183
Poetae Graeci, 17, 18
 Polwhele, Richard, 145, 236, 240
 Polybius, 3, 5, 103, 245
 Pomardi, Simone, 200
 Pomey, F. A., 171 n. 4
 Pomfret, Earl of, 176 n. 2
 Pompeii, 168, 169
 Pope, Alexander, 5, 65, 84, 124-8, 130,
 136, 142, 146, 147, 159, 237, 238
 Porden, C. F., 215, 216
 Porphyry, 118, 119, 245
 Porson, Richard, 2, 5, 6, 22, 27, 28 n. 2,
 30, 35, 47, 49, 50, 54, 56, 57, 62,
 67-76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83,
 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91, 98, 101,
 118, 152, 153, 156, 200, 223, 224,
 227, 228, 230, 232, 234
 Portal, Abraham, 240, 241
 Postlethwaite, Thomas, 68, 72
 Pote's Pentalogia, 17
 Potter, John, 4, 15, 37, 108 n. 6, 145 n. 4
 Potter, Robert, 147, 150 n. 1, 151-2,
 153, 235, 237, 240
 Preston, William, 236
 Price, 37, 38
 Price, H., 238
 Price, Uvedale, 243
 Price, W. C., 243
 Prideaux, Humphry, 176
 Priestley, Joseph, 222
 Primatt, William, 225, 226, 233
 Proclus, 118, 119
 Professors of Greek, Aberdeen, 43
 Cambridge, 28-30
 Edinburgh, 42, 44-5
 Glasgow, 43-4
 Oxford, 30-2
 Psalmanazar, George, 104
 Pugin, A. N. W., 218
 Pye, H. J., 150 n. 3, 239, 241, 245
 Pythagoras, 119

 Railton, William, 181 n. 1
 Raine, Matthew, 14
 Raleigh, Sir Walter, 104
 Randolph, John, 28 n. 5, 31
 Rayner, William, 245
 Reading School, 20, 21
 Reallie, J., 235
 Reiske, J. J., 55, 56
 Rennell, James, 185
 Reveley, Willey, 178, 181 n. 1, 209
 Revett, Nicholas, 175, 178, 179, 180-1,
 182, 191, 207, 210
 Richardson, A. E., 218 n. 1
 Richardson, William, 236

 Ritson, Isaac, 238
 Robertson, Joseph, 71
 Robinson, Hastings, 233
 Robinson, Henry Crabb, 79
 Robinson, Thomas, 65, 66, 111, 233
 Rogers, B. B., 157, 227, 228
 Rollin, Charles, 103
 Rooke, John, 241
 Roper, D. R., 215
 Routh, M. J., 67 n. 1, 233
 Rowe, Nicholas, 153
 Royston, Lord, 145, 238
 Ruhnken, David, 46, 49, 57, 58, 72, 82,
 91, 233
 Russell, 235

Sabrinæ Corolla, 23, 84
 St Amand, James, 63
 St Andrews University, 42
 St Mark's, N. Audley Street, 215, 216
 St Matthew's, Brixton, 215, 216
 St Pancras Church, 215
 St Paul's School, 10 n. 1, 14
 Sallustius, 118, 245
 Sammet, 56 n. 4
 Sandwich, Earl of, 177
 Sandys, George, 183
 Sandys, Sir John, 1, 140 n. 3, 227
 Sappho, 88, 145, 239
 Scapula, Johann, 78
 Schlegel, A. W., 148
 Schliemann, Heinrich, 183, 185
 Scholefield, James, 35, 89, 101
 Schutz, C. G., 71
 Schweighäuser, Johann, 58, 98, 228
 Scott, Sir Gilbert, 216
 Scott, J. N., 237
 Scott, Sir Walter, 7
Scriptores Graeci, 18
 Seale, J. B., 33, 233
 Secker, Thomas, 222
 Selden, John, 176
 Shaftesbury, Earl of, 43, 116, 131 n. 2
 Shakespeare, William, 131 n. 5, 147, 153
 Sharp, William, 31
 Shaw, John, 56 n. 4, 233
 Shaw, Thomas, 31
 Shelley, P. B., 113, 121-2, 158, 159, 161,
 164, 165, 168-71
 Sheridan, Thomas, 21, 240
 Shrewsbury School, 14, 23, 24
 Simonides, 151
 Simpson, Bolton, 66, 233
 Slade, J., 239
 Sloane, Hans, 176
 Smirke, Sir Robert, 209 n. 1, 211, 212-13
 Smith, William, 103, 106 n. 4, 243, 245

- Soane, Sir John, 209, 210
 Socrates, 30, 114, 161
 Sophocles, 21, 30, 59, 60, 62, 99, 100,
 149-50, 151, 153, 154, 163, 164,
 165, 168, 222, 240
Ajax, 59, 98, 240
Antigone, 17, 60, 240
Electra, 17 n. 3, 34, 59, 149, 240
Oedipus Coloneus, 17, 98, 99
Oedipus Tyrannus, 17, 18, 20, 45, 85,
 98, 99, 240
Philoctetes, 17, 61, 240
Trachiniae, 17, 20, 60
 Sotheby, William, 238
 Southey, Robert, 33, 97
 Sparta, 166 n. 1
 Spelman, Edward, 242, 245
 Spence, Joseph, 187
 Spencer, Lord, 3
 Spens, Harry, 113, 244
 Spillan, Daniel, 240
 Spon, Jacob, 180, 194
 Sprengell, Sir C. J., 242
 Squire, Samuel, 51 n. 2, 111, 233, 244
 Stackelberg, Baron von, 202, 204, 205
 Stafford Grammar School, 22
 Stanley, Thomas, 59, 92, 145
 Stanmore School, 19, 20, 21
 Stanyan, Temple, 103, 104, 106 n. 4, 107
 Stephanus, Henricus, 93, 95
 Sterling, James, 239
 Stesichorus, 88, 158
 Stevenson, John, 43
 Stewart, Dugald, 217
 Stobaeus, 36, 100
 Stock, Joseph, 4, 233
 Strabo, 58, 96
 Stuart, James, 175, 178, 179, 180-1, 182,
 191, 201 n. 1, 207, 209, 210
 Suidas, 56, 71, 100
 Swinburne, A. C., 158, 173
 Sydenham, Floyer, 113, 117, 118, 244
 Symmonds, John, 235
 Talboys, D. A., 235
 Tasker, William, 239
 Taunton Grammar School, 19
 Taylor, Edward, 239
 Taylor, Isaac, 242
 Taylor, John, 51 n. 2, 54-5, 225, 233
 Taylor, Thomas, 113, 117-19, 239, 241,
 242, 243, 244, 245
 Taylor, Walter, 29
 Terence, 154
 Terentianus Maurus, 49, 77
 Terry, Thomas, 31
 Tew, Edward, 84
 Theobald, Lewis, 236, 239, 240, 244
 Theocritus, 37, 56, 63, 64, 144, 145, 230,
 240
 Theodoret, 100
 Theognis, 229
 Theophrastus, 33, 34, 232, 233, 245
 Thirlwall, Connop, 14, 38-9, 101, 109, 159
 Thomson, Alexander, 218 n. 1
 Thomson, James, 114, 159, 241
 Thomson, T. G., 233
 Thompson, Ebenezer, 243
 Thompson, W. H., 39
 Thucydides, 18, 21, 22, 37, 46, 47, 66,
 103, 140, 224 n. 4, 231, 234, 245
 Thurlow, Lord, 236
 Thwaites, Edward, 31
 Tickell, Thomas, 237
 Tischbein, J. H. W., 186
 Tooke, Andrew, 171
 Tooke, W., 243
 Toulmin, Joshua, 242
 Toup, Jonathan, 3, 49, 55, 56-7, 63, 64,
 71, 233
 Townley, Charles, 177, 185, 188, 189, 194
 Tragedy, Greek, 147-54, 159
 Performances of, 20-1
 Travis, George, 71
 Trelawny, E. J., 167, 168
 Tremeneheere, William, 238
 Triclinius, 62
 Troy, site of, 183-5
 Tuómy, Martin, 237
 Turnebus, Adrianus, 62
 Turner, J. M. W., 191
 Twining, Thomas, 130, 147, 148, 150-1,
 233, 241
 Tyrtaeus, 43, 145, 240
 Tyrwhitt, Robert, 80 n. 5
 Tyrwhitt, Thomas, 49, 55, 56, 57-9, 62,
 63, 81, 82, 224, 227, 233
 Tytler, H. W., 237
Universal History, The, 104
 University College, London, 212
 Upton, James, 19, 233
 Upton, John, 233
 Urquart, D. H., 235
 Valckenaer, L. K., 60, 90 n. 1
 Valpy, A. J., 85, 93
 Valpy, Richard, 20, 21, 93
 Verse Composition, Greek, 18-19, 23,
 28, 36, 52-3, 82-4
 Vigerus, 37
 Villosion, J. B. G. d'A. de, 58, 82
 Vincent, William, 3, 67 n. 1, 234
 Virgil, 8, 125, 135

- Visconti, E. A., 195
 Vitruvius, 175, 181, 202, 208
 Voltaire, 103

 Wakefield, Gilbert, 17, 77, 78-81, 139-40, 145, 155, 184, 222 n. 1, 223 n. 2, 224, 227, 234
 Waldegrave, Thomas, 32
 Walpole, Horace, 119, 155 n. 5, 176, 208
 Walpole, Robert, 234
 Warburton, William, 3, 56
 Warren, Richard, 234
 Warrington Academy, 221, 222 n. 1
 Warton, Joseph, 15, 142 n. 5, 161, 163
 Warton, Thomas, 56, 63-4, 78, 161-3, 164, 166 n. 1, 224, 234
 Wasse, Joseph, 49, 234
 Watson, Christopher, 245
 Watson, J. S., 228
 Wedgwood, Josiah, 186-7
 Wells, Edward, 234
 Wellwood, James, 245
 Welsted, Leonard, 53, 243
 Wesley, Samuel, 238
 West, Benjamin, 194
 West, Gilbert, 146, 162 n. 4, 237, 239, 244
 West, Richard (1671-1716), 53, 146 n. 4
 West, Richard (d. 1726), 237
 West, Richard (1716-42), 25
 Westmacott, Richard, 196
 Westminster School, 14, 16, 23, 224
 Weston, Stephen, 84, 234
 Wheelwright, C. A., 239
 Wheeler, Sir George, 180, 194
 Whiston, William, 243
 White, James, 236
 Whitehead, William, 160
 Wilkie, David, 194
 Wilkie, William, 45, 159

 Wilkins, William, 197, 201-2, 211-12, 220
 Wilkinson, John, 114 n. 3
 Wilkinson, William, 114
 Williams, Peter, 238
 Winchester College, 14, 19
 Winckelmann, J. J., 46, 188
 Winkles, H. B., 206
 Winstanley, Thomas, 234
 Wodhull, Michael, 147, 151, 237
 Wolf, F. A., 1, 37, 65, 136, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142
 Wolf, Hieronymus, 55
 Wood, Robert, 8, 132-3, 138, 152, 179, 181, 183, 184
 Woods, Joseph, 181 n. 1
 Wordsworth, William, 121, 164-5
 Worsley, Sir Richard, 178
 Wyatt, James, 209, 212
 Wytttenbach, Daniel, 49, 57, 82, 96

 Xenophon, 12, 18, 21, 32, 42, 47, 66, 112, 114, 245
 Agésilas, 66, 233
 Anabasis, 34, 37, 66, 245
 Constitution of Athens, 245
 Cynegetica, 245
 Cyropaedia, 34, 37, 66, 245
 Hellenica, 37, 103, 245
 Hiero, 245
 Memorabilia, 34, 37, 66, 229, 230, 233, 234, 245
 Oeconomicus, 245
 Symposium, 245

 Young, Edward, 131-2
 Young, John, 43
 Young, Rev. William, 152 n. 1, 155, 236, 242
 Young, Sir William, 106 n. 3
 Younger, Hercules, 235

